THE ELOHIST AND NORTH ISRAELITE TRADITIONS

A thesis presented

by

Alan Wilkin Jenks

to

The Committee on Higher Degrees

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Theology
in the subject of
Old Testament

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
April, 1965

Copyright by Alan Wilkin Jenks
All rights reserved.

FOREWORD

In the torrent of literature dealing with the history and composition of the Pentateuch, only a small trickle has been devoted to the E tradition. Of the three monographs examining E, two have attempted to show that the passages ascribed to E do not represent an ancient and independent epic tradition at all, but are simply supplements to the J tradition.[1] In most teaching and writing on the Pentateuch, less attention is accorded the E tradition than J. This is a result of the fact that E is much less fully and clearly represented in the present Pentateuch than J, but also, we believe, because E is judged a later and intrinsically less significant body of traditions than J.

These considerations alone would justify a new treatment of E. The development of new methods and views in

---

[1] The two monographs rejecting E as an independent tradition are: P. Volz and W. Rudolph, *Der Elohist als Erzähler ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?*, BZAW 63 (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1933); W. Rudolph, *Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua*, BZAW 68 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1938). The only other monograph on the E tradition is Otto Procksch's *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch die Elohimquelle* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1906).

Pentateuchal criticism makes such a treatment even more desirable. In the following pages we shall attempt to answer those who would discard the hypothesis of an independent E tradition. We shall show at the same time that the methods and suppositions of the older critics were often pretentious or faulty, so that some of the modern attacks on their work have been justified. We hope to show that there is a sizeable and significant body of traditions in the Pentateuch which can be assigned to E, even though earlier critics exaggerated the certainty with which these traditions can be isolated and the number of common stylistic features which can be detected in them. Most important, we shall show that there is good evidence for assigning a very early date to these traditions, and for connecting their formulation with the time of the division of the Kingdom, ca. 922 B.C. Thus placed in history, E can be seen as an early expression of the religious views and emphases which can be discerned in a whole stream of North Israelite literature, from the Samuel traditions to the Book of Deuteronomy.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD ii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS v

Chapter
- I. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE E SOURCE BY LITERARY CRITICISM 1
  - The Methodological Foundation
  - The Identification of the E Tradition
  - The Description of the E Source by Literary Criticism
- II. TOWARD A NEW VIEW OF E: CRITICISM FROM 1900 TO THE PRESENT 58
  - The Impact of Form Criticism
  - The Disappearance of Separate Sources
  - The Rejection of E as an Independent Source
  - The Structure and Origin of the Hexateuch
- III. THE CONTENT AND SCOPE OF E 93
  - The Patriarchal Narratives
  - The Exodus and Sinai Covenant Traditions
  - The Wilderness Wandering
  - The Conquest
  - The Primeval History
- IV. THE E TRADITION AND EARLY NORTHERN PROPHECY . . 203
  - The Prophetic Traditions of Samuel
  - The Elijah-Elisha Traditions
  - The Date and Provenance of E
- V. E AND LATER NORTH ISRAELITE TRADITIONS . . . 267
  - Hosea
  - Deuteronomy

BIBLIOGRAPHY 294

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BA, *The Biblical Archeologist*
BASOR, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BJRL, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
BWANT, *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*
BZAW, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CH, J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1889).
FRLANT, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*.
FSAC, W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1957).
HAT, *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, ed. Otto Eissfeldt
HI, *History of Israel*--refers, as indicated, to John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), or to Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, trans. Stanley Godman (New York: Harpers, 1958).
HTR, *Harvard Theological Review*
IB, *The Interpreter's Bible*
ICC, *International Critical Commentaries*
IDB, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
JBL, *Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBR, *Journal of Bible and Religion*
JDT, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*
JNES, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JSS, *Journal of Semitic Studies*
KHCAT, *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament*
KS, Albrecht Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols (2. Aufl.; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1959).
OTMS, *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951).
TLZ, *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*
ÜP, Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2. Aufl.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948).
ÜSt, Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).
VT, *Vetus Testamentum*
ZAW, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDMG, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

CHAPTER I

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE E SOURCE BY LITERARY CRITICISM

(I) The Methodological Foundation

Before the E-source in the Pentateuch could be identified and distinguished, a foundation of critical method had to be laid. As is always true in scholarship, this method had to evolve through a long process of trial and error. Stumbling blocks presented by long-held beliefs had to be removed, but the new theories and methods themselves often grew into further stumbling blocks when they were absolutized. The discovery that different sources could be identified by their characteristic use of the divine names "Yahweh" and "Elohim" was a major break-through, but the new method impeded further progress until it was discovered that *two* sources (our "P" and "E") used *Elohim*. This and other stumbling blocks, some created by scholars themselves, meant that it took nearly a century to develop the method for isolating and dating the Pentateuchal traditions, once the initial break-through had been made by Jean Astruc in 1753.

Before Astruc's contribution could be appreciated, however, an ancient and formidable stumbling block had to be removed: the belief that Moses, and Moses alone, wrote the books of the Pentateuch. Even enlightened scholars were preoccupied with this question until the early nineteenth century.

(A) The Question of Mosaic Authorship

It had been the official and all but unanimous view in both Judaism and Christianity that Moses had written the entire Pentateuch by divine inspiration.[1] Some were disturbed by glaring inconsistencies in the application of this doctrine, for example in the case of the account of Moses' death (Dt. 34:5-12).[2] But even Josephus stoutly maintained that Moses wrote the story of his own death in advance by special inspiration.[3]

Not all were convinced. The great Jewish commentator Ibn Ezra (1088-1167) expressed his doubt about Mosaic authorship in a prudently guarded way. Commenting on the phrase

---

[1] Ecclus. 24:23; Dan. 9:11, 13; Josephus, Antiquities, Preface, 4.

[2] Cf. Baba Bathra, 14b, apparently attributing this passage to Joshua.

[3] Antiquities IV: 8: 48.

"beyond the Jordan in the wilderness" in Dt. 1:1, Ibn Ezra implied that this and other passages suggested a date of writing later than Moses:

> 'Beyond the Jordan in the wilderness in the Arabah'--and if you understand the mystery of the twelve, and also 'and Moses wrote,' and 'the Canaanite was still in the land,' 'in the mount of the Lord it will be provided,' and also 'and behold his bed is an iron bed,'--then you will perceive the truth.[4]

"The truth" to which Ibn Ezra so cryptically alludes must be that Moses could not have thought of the wilderness as the other side of the Jordan (Dt. 1:1); that Moses could not have written the twelve-verse long account of his own death (Dt. 34); that Moses would not have written the words 'and Moses wrote' (Dt. 31:9); that Moses would not have commented about the Canaanites still being in the land (Gen. 12:6) in the time of Abraham, or about the bed of Og being a famous relic of the Conquest still preserved in Rabath-Ammon (Dt. 3:11). The reference to 'the mount of the Lord' is drawn from Gen. 22:14, and must be taken by Ibn Ezra as an anachronistic reference to the Jerusalem Temple.[5]

---

[4] Johannis Buxtorf, Biblica Rabbinica (Basel, 1665), ad. loc.; my translation.

[5] Cf. Spinoza, Tractatus Theologico-Politicus in the edition of his Opera (Jena: 1802), Vol. I, pp. 277-278.

Not until the era of the Reformation, when a few scholars, both Catholic[6] and Protestant,[7] raised similar doubts, did Ibn Ezra's temerity find any equal. But it remained for Enlightenment thinkers to bring the problem fully into the open. Thomas Hobbes, in his Leviathan, maintained:

> It is not argument enough that they were written by Moses, because they are called the five Books of Moses; no more than these titles, The Book of Ioshua, the Book of Iuges, the Book of Ruth, & the Books of the Kings, are arguments sufficient to prove, that they were written by Ioshua, by the Iuges, by Ruth, & by the Kings. For in titles of Books, the subject is marked, as often as the writer.[8]

Hobbes even made reference to the words of Dt. 34:6 and Gen. 12:6, just as Ibn Ezra had done, as proofs that Moses could not have written these books.[9]

The philosopher Spinoza, knowing the works of Ibn Ezra directly, described him as "liberioris ingenii Vir et non mediocri eruditionis."[10] In the context of a brilliant plea for historical criticism of the Scriptures, Spinoza concluded:

---

[6] Cf. Benedictus Pereira, S.J., who recognized non-Mosaic passages in Genesis: Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim, (Rome, 1591), Vol. I, pp. 6,8.

[7] Cf. Carlstadt in Libellus de canonicus scripturis, printed in K.A. Credner, Zur Geschichte des Kanons (Halle, 1847), pp. 364-371.

[8] T. Hobbes, Leviathan (Oxford, 1881), p. 298.

[9] Ibid., pp. 298-299.

> Cum itaque non constet, Mosen alios, praeter hos libros scripsisse, et ipse nullum alium praeter Libelli legis cum Cantico posteritati religiose servandum mandaverit et denique plura in Pentateucho occurrant, quae a Mose scribi non potuerunt, sequitur, *neminem cum fundamento, sed omino contra rationem affirmare, Mosen autorem esse Pentateuchi.*[11]

The phantom of Mosaic authorship could not be completely expelled, however, by men working outside the dominant Christian communions. It remained for scholars within the churches to recognize the facts pointed out by writers like Spinoza and Hobbes. This was done most brilliantly by the French Oratorian priest, Richard Simon (1638-1712). Simon, in his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*,[12] noted the variety of different types of material included in the Pentateuch and took account of the many contradictions between various passages. He proposed that even if Moses was the author of some passages he must have made use of various more ancient documents, and that some of the confusion in the narratives may have resulted from the mechanical juxtaposition of written sources which were not homogeneous.[13] Simon distinguished between the divine commandments, inspired by God--this satisfied orthodoxy--and the historical narratives, which were drawn from human documents.[14]

---

[10] *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 277.

[11] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 283.

[12] (Paris, 1680).

The remarks of Simon in which he postulates the composition of the Pentateuch through the use of various ancient documents seem to presage the critical theories of the nineteenth century, and it is perhaps unfortunate that this scholar did not push his critical work further. He was, however, mainly concerned with the theological task of separating the problem of authorship from the doctrine of divine inspiration--itself a laudable and much needed enterprise.[15] In any case, after Simon and his predecessors, students of the Pentateuch took the doctrine of Mosaic authorship less and less seriously until the question was finally dropped altogether.

What was lacking in the work of Simon, and of those before him who had noted the many inconsistencies within the Pentateuch, was a method of distinguishing and characterizing the putative sources of which the final work was composed. The first step toward the development of such a literary-critical method was the discovery of the variation in the use of the divine names, and the development of a theory to account for this variation. To later scholars this first theory came to be known as "The Early Documentary Hypothesis."

---

[13] *Op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.

[15] Cf. Jean Steinmann, *Richard Simon et les origines de l'exégèse biblique* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1960), p. 100.

(B) The Early Documentary Hypothesis

The task of identifying and separating the sources of the Pentateuch was initiated not by a biblical scholar or theologian, but by a renowned French physican and professor of medicine, Jean Astruc (1694-1766). Astruc was serving as court physician to Louis XV when he published his *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse*.[16] In his book Astruc attempted a division of the text of Genesis into its original component documents, discovering that the alternation in the divine names could be used as a means of distinguishing the sources.[17]

---

[16] (Brussels, 1753).

Describing the documents as *mémoires*, Astruc describes his method as follows:

> Je n'ai eu qu'à joindre ensemble tous les endroits, où Dieu est constamment appelé *Elohim*: je les ai placez sur une columne, que j'ai nommée A, & je les ai regardez comme autant de morceaux, ou si l'on veut, de fragmens d'un premier mémoire original, que je designe par la lettre A.
>
> J'ai placé a costé sur une autre columne, que j'appele B, tous les autres endroits, où l'on ne donne point à Dieu d'autre nom, que celui de *Jehovah*, & j'ai rassemblé par là, tous les morceaux, ou du moins, tous les fragmens d'un second mémoire B . . .[18]

Astruc believed that these two sources, one using the name *Elohim* and the other *Jehovah*, formed the core of the Genesis narrative. As his work advanced, Astruc records, he was forced to distinguish a number of other minor documents or *mémoires* which could not be fitted into the "A" or "B" sources. These were placed in a third column labelled "C."

---

[17] Thanks to an article of Lods it is now known that Astruc was anticipated in his method by H. B. Wetter, who in 1711 recognized the possibility of separating the two Creation stories in Gen. 1-2 by means of the divine names; A. Lods, *Jean Astruc et la critique Biblique au XVIIIe siècle* (Strasbourg: Libraire Istra, 1924), pp. 54-55. But Astruc remains the first to have carried this sort of analysis through Genesis.

[18] J. Astruc, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

Finally, the remaining material in Genesis was attributed either to a fourth Hebrew mémoire or to other sources of Midianite or Arabian origin.[19]

Astruc's contribution to the advance of biblical scholarship can be summed up under two headings: (1) By concentrating on the problem of separating the sources in Genesis, Astruc directed attention away from the question of authorship.[20] Even though some later scholars assumed that Moses, Ezra, or some other person was the final editor, this question ceased to be a matter of interest, at least among scholars. (2) Astruc's identification of two sources on the basis of the names "Yahweh" and "Elohim" was ultimately accepted as a primary criterion for separating the "J" and "E" strands, even though much advance was later made on Astruc's division, and other criteria were recognized in addition to the divine names.

Astruc's successor in the development of the Early Documentary Hypothesis was the great Göttingen scholar, J. G. Eichhorn (1752-1827). Eichhorn, in whom the move away from the question of authorship can also be observed,[21] arrived independently at conclusions similar to Astruc's.[22] Speaking of the sources in Genesis, Eichhorn states, "Es sind darin einige einzelne, für sich bestehende Urkünden aufgennomen." As examples he cites the verses which give the second account of the Creation, Gen. 2:4-3:24; these verses "machen so ein eigenes abgesondertes Document aus." In addition, "Abgebrochen und einzeln steht auch das vierzehnte Kapitel, in die Geschichte Abrahams eingeschaltet, da."[23] But aside from these separate documents, "Der grösste Theil ist aus Stücken zweyer besondern historischen Werke zusammengesetzt."[24]

---

[19] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[20] Cf. Lods, op. cit., p. 26.

---

[21] In the first edition of his Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Leipzig, 1787), Eichhorn maintained the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But in the fourth edition (1823) the whole section entitled "Moses" is much shortened, and now entitled, "Mosäische Schriften." In this 1823 edition, Eichhorn does not argue any more that Moses must be the author of the Pentateuch, but that the writings must come from the Mosaic era; (Göttingen, 1823), Vol.III, pp.15-17.

[22] Ibid., Vol. III, p. 23. Eichhorn apparently knew of Astruc's work only indirectly through reviews of Michaelis and Jerusalem. Cf. A. Westphal, Les Sources du Pentateuque (Paris, 1888), Vol. I, p. 120.

[23] Op. cit. (1st ed., 1787), Vol. II, pp. 261-63.

[24] Ibid., p. 264.

The great importance of Eichhorn's work for the advance of Pentateuchal study lay in his careful statement of the reasons for the division of sources, in which he recognized other criteria in addition to the use of Yahweh and Elohim. Eichhorn cited: (1) The evidence of repetitions and doublets in the narrative; (2) The evidence of stylistic differences between parallel accounts; (3) The evidence of different theological interests and emphases which accompany the stylistic differences.[25]

The final stage in the development of the Early Documentary Hypothesis can be seen in the work of Karl David Ilgen, professor of Philosophy and Oriental Literature at Jena. In Ilgen's book, published in 1798, seventeen different documents were detected in Genesis, their composition being attributable to three different writers. The title of Ilgen's book makes clear his basic theory, that Genesis is a concatenation of archival material: Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt als Berichtigung der Geschichte der Religion & Politik aus dem Hebräischen mit kritischen und erklärenden Anmerkungen auch mancherlei dazu gehörigen Abhandlungen.

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 264-70.

In his identification of the seventeen documents theoretically lying behind the Book of Genesis, Ilgen appeals to "Beweis aus den unrechten Orte stehenden Ueberschriften," (e.g., Gen. 2:4a),[26] "Beweis aus den Wiederholungen,"[27] "Beweis aus der Verschiedenheit des Stils,"[28] and "Beweis aus der Verschiedenheit des Charakters."[29] Of the three writers or scribes who composed the seventeen documents, one characteristically used *Yahweh* for the Deity, while the other two used *Elohim*.

Ilgen's identification of a second Elohistic document might seem to anticipate the work of Hupfeld, who was the first to distinguish the "Elohist" from the Priestly source (see below, p. 29); some have even attributed the discovery of the Elohist tradition to Ilgen rather than to Hupfeld.[30] But in fact Ilgen's Second Elohistic source consists of such mere scraps of passages,[31] and his method of separating the sources is so arbitrary and undefended, that it must be said that Ilgen does not anticipate later findings about "E" in any important way. What this means is that scholars continued to labor under the misapprehension that the "Elohistic" passages were all from the same source. Only with Hupfeld would this finally be cleared up. If there was any scholar who anticipated later theories about "E," it was Ewald (see below, p. 20). In the meantime, the fragment hypothesis discussed below may have represented an attempt to deal with the problem by attributing each individual narrative unit to a different source.

---

[26] Op. cit.(Halle, 1798), p. 351.

[27] *Ibid*., p. 362.

[28] *Ibid*., p. 370.

[29] *Ibid*., p. 400.

[30] So Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (2te Aufl.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956), p. 190.

(C) The Fragment Hypothesis

Both Astruc and Eichhorn had recognized the existence of sources other than the "Yahwistic" and "Elohistic" in Genesis, although both had maintained that these latter constituted the greater part of the material. But in the work of Ilgen one can perceive a tendency to break down these larger units into smaller ones. In the "fragment hypothesis" the tendency reaches its extreme, and we find scholars denying the existence of any unified narrative basis whatever.

---

[31] E.G., Gen. 1:5b, 8b, 13, 19b, 23b, 31b; 2:1-2; 2:4b-3:24; 7:1-13, etc.

The new "fragment" approach first appeared in an annotated translation of the Bible by the English Roman Catholic scholar, Alexander Geddes, published in London 1792-1800.[32] Geddes separates himself from Astruc and Eichhorn immediately, describing their division of the sources as "the work of fancy." In Geddes's opinion the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua were most probably compiled in the reign of Solomon by an editor who "collected from such documents as he could find, either among his own people or among the neighbouring nations."[33] Geddes proceeds to print the text of the Bible so as to show the many fragmentary divisions he found.

Geddes's work was introduced to German readers in a commentary on the Pentateuch published in 1802-1805 by J. S. Vater.[34] Here the fragment hypothesis was systematically applied to the whole of the Pentateuch.

---

[32] The Holy Bible, with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Remarks, ed. A. Geddes (London, 1792-1800).

[33] A. Geddes, op. cit., Vol. I, p. xix.

[34] Commentar über den Pentateuch mit Einleitungen zu den einzelnen Abschnitten der eingeschalteten Übersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes's merkwürdigen critischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen (Halle, 1802).

> Die Bücher des Pentateuchs, sie alle vom ersten bis zum letzten, zerfallen in einzelne Stücke, in grosse, kleiner, auch ganz kleine Stüche, von welchem sich nicht zeigen lässt, dass ursprünglich zwischen ihnen ein Zusammenhang statt fand. Bey den meisten derselben fällt vielmehr das Gegentheil deutlich in die Augen.[35]

In Vater's opinion we cannot know who the final editor of the Pentateuch was, though he argues at length that this editing can be dated to the Exile.[36] In the course of this discussion Vater makes several points which were later to become significant in Pentateuchal criticism. He held, for example, that the Pentateuchal laws must be later than the time of Moses because many of them seem to be unknown in the period covered by the books of Samuel and Kings.[37]

Vater is critical of the work of Astruc, Eichhorn, and Ilgen. He claims that the main criterion for distinguishing the sources postulated by these scholars is always the use of the divine names. The criterion of style, worked out by Eichhorn, is rejected as insufficiently proven. Without a conjunction of the criteria of style *and* the use of the divine name, Vater declared, the whole enterprise becomes completely arbitrary.[38] His skeptical conclusion is still a healthy warning:

---

[35] J. S. Vater, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 393.

[36] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 678.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 652-55.

> Es is überhaupt ein sehr gewagtes Unternahmen, in Büchern, welche vor fast dritthalbtausend Jahren, aus einzelnen Aufsätzen entstanden sind, nicht bloss überhaupt zu zeigen, dass sie aus einzelnen Aufsätzen, sondern auch, aus wie vielen sie zusammengesetzt seyen, ja sogar zu welchen von vielen Aufsätzen jedes einzelne Wort der Genesis gehöre.[39]

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the work of both Geddes and Vater is that, unlike most critics before them, they pushed the application of literary criticism beyond the Book of Genesis into the rest of the Pentateuch. Their fragment hypothesis was in part an attempt to deal with this wider ranger of literature, for they found that the documentary hypothesis that worked well in Genesis did not apply so convincingly to the later books.[40]

(D) The Supplement Hypothesis

At approximately the same time another line of study was being carried on which carried literary criticism into the whole of the Pentateuch. The initiator of this new approach was W. M. L. De Wette, like Ilgen a teacher at Jena, and most famous in Old Testament scholarship for his identification of Josiah's Book of the Law (II Kgs. 22-23) with the Book of Deuteronomy.[41]

---

[38] _Ibid_., pp. 715-16.

[39] _Ibid_., p. 713.

[40] Cf. O. Eissfeldt, _Einleitung_, pp. 209-216.

Moving beyond the mere identification of sources, De Wette considered the Pentateuch as an epic whole and saw within the mass of materials a framework on which all else depended. Here he broke sharply with the fragment hypothesis, and at the same time advanced considerably beyond the work of Astruc and Eichhorn in perceiving the underlying unity of the whole Pentateuch.

> Durch die Genesis und den Anfang des Exodus zieht sich ein ursprüngliches Ganzes, eine Art von epischen Gedicht, das früher als fast alle übrigen Stücke und von diesen gleichsam das Original, der Urkundensammlung über diesen Theil der Geschichte als Grundlage gedient hat, auf welche die übrigen als Erläuterungen und Supplemente aufgetragen sind.[42]

This epic was described by De Wette as "ein ächt hebräisches Nationalepos, von wahrem Nationalinteresse, ganz im Geiste des Hebräismus; es ist das Epos der hebräischen Theokratie."[43]

---

[41] In his dissertation, "Qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum alius cuyusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse, monstratur" (Jena, 1805).

[42] Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Halle, 1807), Vol. II, p. 29.

[43] Ibid., p. 30.

He dated the epic, which was basically the same as Eichhorn's "Elohistic Document," to the Davidic period at the earliest.[44] The source using *Yahweh*, De Wette believed, was not a real parallel strand at all, but a series of additions to the basic Elohistic narrative. The distinction between *Yahweh* and *Elohim* is not taken as a sign of different authors, but as a mark of two different periods or "schools."[45]

De Wette had his supporters in this supplement hypothesis; other scholars, notably F. Bleek[46] and F. Tuch,[47] carried on this type of analysis without adding anything essentially new. The impasse which had been reached between proponents of the "Early Documentary Hypothesis," the "Fragment Hypothesis," and the "Supplement Hypothesis" could not be resolved without the introduction of a new approach to the entire set of problems. This new approach was offered by the development of an historical reconstruction into which the "sources" detected in the Pentateuch could be fitted.

---

[44] *Ibid*., pp. 23, 31.

[45] *Ibid*., pp. 29-30.

[46] *De Libri Genesis origine*. I did not have access to this book, which is referred to by H.-J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historischen-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956), p. 452. But the same views are expressed in Bleek and Kampenhausen's *Einleitung* (2te. auf.; Berlin, 1865), p. 256.

[47] *Commentar über die Genesis* (Halle, 1838).

(E) The Historical Problem

The painstaking analysis of the text of the Pentateuch which had led to these divergent theories had not been carried on without reference to the date of the sources in question. But so far dating had been attempted chiefly on the basis of a highly subjective "feeling" for the atmosphere of a writing. No attempt had been made to offer an entire reconstruction of the history of Israel and her religion, but this would be needed before the Pentateuchal sources could be viewed in their true light.

The beginnings of such a broadly-based dating of the Pentateuchal materials can be found in the work of De Wette. In the first volume of his Beiträge De Wette had made the programmatic pronouncement, "Das sichtigste Augenmerk für den Forscher der Israelitischen Geschichte muss die Geschichte der Religion und des Gottesdienstes seyn."[48]

De Wette had been forced to this position by his study of the Books of Chronicles, in which he compared the cultus described there with that described or reflected in the Books of Samuel and Kings, and with that described in the Pentateuchal law codes. His conclusion had been that the ritual and ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, like the cultus described in Chronicles, is later than the books of Samuel and Kings, and also later than Deuteronomy.[49]

---

[48] Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 4.

The thorough-going application of De Wette's findings would have led to the separation of the (Priestly) Elohistic material, as was later done. But the feeling that the "Elohist" was the basic and earliest source was so firmly established that it was another half century before scholars were willing to accept a late date for it.

De Wette's interest in relating literary criticism to the religious history of Israel was shared and furthered by the work of Heinrich G. A. Ewald (1803-1875). A towering figure in Oriental and Biblical studies, Ewald was professor at Göttingen from 1827 until his death, except for a period of political exile during which he worked at Tübingen.[50]

---

[49] *Ibid*., Vol. I, pp. 4-5, 262; Vol. II, p. 299.

[50] T. W. Davies, *Heinrich Ewald, Orientalist and Theologian* (London, 1903); H. J. Kraus, *op. cit*., pp. 182-85.

Ewald was best known to the English-speaking world as the author of a seven-volume History of Israel which appeared in English translation in 1869.[51]

Ewald, a supporter of the supplementary hypothesis,[52] was more interested in problems of historical development than in the bare study of the text of the sources. In his Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel he delineated four narrators or sources in the Pentateuch, and characterized each one with reference to a stage in Israel's religious history or to a religious group in Israel. The first, designated "The Book of Origins" after Gen. 2:4a, was described as priestly, as shown by the great interest in priestly law, and dated to the early monarchy.[53] The fourth source, also priestly, is identified with the work of the final editor of the books Genesis-Joshua, who also added some material of his own (e.g., Gen. 6:1-8; 8:20-22; 22:1-5).[54]

---

[51] Trans. from the 2d. ed. of Geschichte des Volkes Israels and with preface and appendix by R. Martineau (London, 1869).

[52] As stated in his review of Stähelin's Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis, Theologischen Studien und Kritiken, IV (1830), pp. 595-606.

[53] Op. cit., 2d. ed., Vol. I, p. 113.

[54] Ibid., pp. 141-53.

The most interesting part of Ewald's study, however, is his description of the two "prophetic narrators" who date from the early monarchy, for the first of these is in many respects indentical with the later E source, the second with the later J.

Of the "first prophetic narrator" Ewald says that his most characteristic feature is "die ungemeine und klare Ansicht vom Wirken des prophetischen und des göttlichen Geistes."[55] This emphasis on the prophetic element comes out most strongly in the passages relating the life of Moses, especially Num. 11-12, but the scheme of the life of Joseph also leads to prophetic truth (Gen. 50:19f.). The frequent introduction of the revelatory dream distinguishes this source and illustrates again the prophetic theory which permeates the whole history. Living perhaps in the tenth or ninth century, while such prophets as Elijah were still active, the first prophetic narrator's work is a reflex of the high prophetic activity of his time. The provenance of the source is probably the Northern Kingdom.[56] We can only remark again on the degree of agreement between this description and the later description of E.

---

[55] Ibid., p. 130. [56] Ibid., pp. 132-133.

To the second prophetic narrator Ewald attributes such passages as Gen. 3; 12:1-3; 18-19; 22:16-18; 26:4f.; 28:14; 32-34; Ex. 32-34. This narrator is dated to the 9th or 8th century. In his work the prophetic idea is expressed in a deeper way, and holds sway over the whole of the history: "Die prophetische Ansicht welche schon im vorigen Werke stark eindrang, breitet sich in diesem mit voller Macht aus und wird die eigentliche Trägerin der ganzen Geschichtserzählung."[57] Again Ewald anticipates a good deal of what would later be said--here of the J source.

The historical reconstructions of both De Wette and Ewald continued to be influential, but the reconstruction which was finally accepted by the greatest number of scholars rested upon three students of De Wette, J. F. L. George, J. K. W. Vatke, and Eduard Reuss. These scholars found a theoretical justification for their reconstruction--this is particularly true of Vatke--in the dominant Hegelian evolutionary philosophy of 19th-century Germany.

The first of these three, Eduard Reuss (1804-1891), taught in Strassburg, and was influential in mediating the findings of German Old Testament scholars to French Protestant circles, for he himself wrote in French.[58] His most famous student was Karl Heinrich Graf (see below, p. 32). As early as 1833 Reuss had formulated certain theses which enlarged upon De Wette's suggestions, but these were not published until 1879.[59] Like De Wette, Reuss found the study of the Pentateuchal laws to be of the greatest significance for the historian and critic of the sources: "L'intérêt principal de l'historien doît porter sur la date des lois, parce que sur ce terrain il a plus de chance d'arriver à des résultats certains. . ."[60] Like De Wette, Reuss found that the Pentateuchal legislation was not reflected in the historical books and the prophets, and was therefore largely of a late date.[61]

---

[57] _Ibid._, p. 134.

In studies which were published in 1835 two other scholars reached similar conclusions independently. The first of these, Leopold George, followed up the suggestion that the key to the history of the Pentateuchal sources was a study of the laws. George distinguished four stages of legal development in the Pentateuch. The first stage is shown in the Decalogue (minus certain later additions), and in part of the narrative material in Exodus. The second stage is the contribution of the prophets:

---

[58] Cf. H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., p. 222.

[59] Cf. J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: Meridian Library, 1957), p. 4.

[60] E. Reuss, L'histoire Sainte et la Loi (Paris, 1879), pp. 23-34.

[61] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

> Auf dieser Basis des ursprünglichen einfachen mosäischen Gesetzes entwickelte sich nun das Volk weiter fort, und seine Entwickelung charakterisirt sich besonders in den Prophetentum, indem die Propheten grade den innersten Kern des Volkes bildeten, und den in demselben wirkenden göttlichen Geist auf eine besonders eminente Weise sich zum Bewusstsein brachten und an sich darstellen, so dass sie in einer fortlaufenden Reihe als Träger dieses göttlichen Geistes erscheinen.[62]

The result of this prophetic influence on legal formulation was the Book of Deuteronomy, representing the third stage.

After the Exile, in George's scheme, Israelite religion was expressed in a concern for externals which was quite different from the earlier prophetic spirituality. This fourth stage is reflected first in the programme of Ezekiel for the ideal Jerusalem, and then in the expansion and formalizing of this in the Levitical law.[63]

---

[62] Die älteren jüdischen Feste mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuchs (Berlin, 1835), pp. 72-73.

[63] Ibid., p. 72.

Much more famous and influential in the history of Old Testament scholarship was the work of Wilhelm Vatke. In his *Biblische Theologie* Vatke introduced Hegelian philosophical categories into the formulation of Biblical history with no reservation.[64] As we might expect, the result is less a study of the historical sources than an exposition of a philosophy of history which uses the Old Testament history as a vehicle.[65]

Vatke begins with a statement of the three necessary stages in the development of religion--religion being defined in the Hegelian manner as the coming to consciousness of the Absolute. In the first stage, Vatke says, man has "natürliches Bewusstsein in unmittelbarer Einheit des Geistigen und Natürlichen, und weisst das Göttliche in derselben Bestimmtheit als geistig-natürliches Substanz."[66] The second stage shows the beginnings of self-consciousness and subjectivity, the tendency toward inwardness which fights against the externalizing and objectifying of religion in nature. The third stage unites the two in "Selbstbewusstsein, Geist, unendlicher Subjecktivität, verhält sich zu seinem Unterschiede als zu sich selbst, hat die Seite des Aeusseren überwunden und ist in dieser unendlichen Bewegung wahrhaft frei."[67]

---

[64] W. Vatke, *Die biblische Theologie, wissenschaftlich dargestellt: die Religion des Alten Testaments nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt* (Berlin, 1835).

[65] Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-82.

[66] W. Vatke, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

Vatke finds the first two stages reflected in the history of Old Testament religion as follows. First, there is the Mosaic period, in which most of the people engaged in nature cults and star worship. Against this, Moses "befestigte das Ansehen des älteren Nationalgottes, suchte den Dienst anderer Götter zu verbannen, vergeistigte die natürlichen Elemente der Vorstellung und des Cultus, und legte den Grund zu einem reineren sittlichen Leben des Volkes."[68] Second, in the period of the Judges began the great conflict between the two elements of outward and inner religion, nature-worship and moral life, which characterized the religious history of Israel for the following centuries.[69]

---

[67] _Ibid._, p. 100.

[68] _Ibid._, pp. 184-85.

[69] _Ibid._, pp. 460-62.

Even though later scholars would seldom depict the religious history of Israel in such explicitly Hegelian terms, Vatke makes plain the type of historical and philosophical presuppositions which continued to underlie Old Testament scholarship, especially in Germany, for a good many years.

It is important also to note the implication which runs through all of Vatke's work, that the Mosaic legislation cannot possibly be dated to the time of Moses. In fact, most of the legal material of the Pentateuch is treated as an Exilic development. The work of Moses was not a finished thing for Vatke, but rather a point of departure for the history of Israel--a history which is defined in terms of an endless conflict between the idolatry of the people in adherence to nature cults, and the prophetic consciousness of true inward religion.[70]

(II) The Identification of the E Tradition

We have seen how Old Testament scholars had turned away from the profitless multiplication of sources in the fragment hypothesis and worked out instead a "supplement hypothesis." Both efforts were hampered by the failure to distinguish between the two types of material which shared the use of Elohim, and at the same time by the failure to work toward a hypothesis which would account for all of the Pentateuchal literature. These problems were for a time set aside while scholars attempted to formulate a clear picture of the history of Israel's religion. Now there began a period in which the various lines of study were brought together into a remarkable synthesis. The way toward this synthesis was made ready by Hupfeld's identification of the E tradition as a separate source.

---

[70] Cf. Westphal, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 170-72.

(A) The Work of Hupfeld

Hermann Hupfeld was an assistant professor of theology at Halle when, in 1853, he published his work, Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung. Hupfeld acknowleged from the start the debt of Old Testament scholarship to De Wette, and actually attributed to De Wette the initial discovery of the E tradition. He pointed out that in his study of the priestly Urschrift of Genesis and Exodus, De Wette had refused to assign to this "Elohistic" priestly writing every passage which used the divine name Elohim. Some of these Elohistic passages were considered by De Wette to be later additions to the base narrative.[71] It was Hupfeld's intention to examine these additions and to find their relation to each other and to the *Urschrift* and the Yahwist.

In his investigation Hupfeld reached the conclusion that there were in fact two narrative sources characterized by the use of *Elohim*: the *Urschrift* and the "Elohist." This latter source was seen to run parallel to the Yahwist from the Abraham narratives through the Joseph stories; the clearest examples of this Elohistic source were the story of Abraham and Sarah at Gerar (Gen. 20) and the account of the covenant with Abimelech (Gen. 21:22-34). But there are other narratives in which Elohistic material has been combined by a redactor, notably in Gen. 22, in the Jacob stories, and in the Joseph narratives.[72]

Hupfeld's method was to take the priestly narrative as the earliest and then to examine the development of the basic themes of this source in the Yahwist and Elohist writings. He concluded that the Elohist always has the form of narrative which stands closer to the *Urschrift*, while the Yahwist shows more expansion and addition of details. Hupfeld theorized that the Elohist "eine mittlere Stellung zwischen der Urschrift und dem JHVHisten . . . einnimmt."[73]

---

[71] H. Hupfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-5.

[72] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-206.

5

Later scholars would of course find Hupfeld's results incorrect because of the fallacy of taking the priestly source as the earliest of the three. But it was still a sizeable contribution to have isolated and discussed the Elohistic material in detail.

With regard to the question of "fragment hypothesis" versus "supplement hypothesis," Hupfeld refused to take either alternative, adhering instead to a modified form of the early documentary hypothesis. He maintained, against proponents of the supplement explanation, that "die JHVHistische Darstellung nicht wohl denkbar ist wenn sie die Elohistische vor sich hatte, noch weniger der umgekehrte Fall; folglich beide Gestaltungen der Sage unabhängig von einander und selbständig aufgezeichnet worden sein müssen."[74]

---

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

(B) The New Documentary Hypothesis

With the work of Hupfeld in distinguishing the sources of the Pentateuch, and the historical studies of De Wette, Ewald, George and Vatke, the stage was now set for the emergence of a comprehensive new hypothesis. The new theory owed its formulation to a famous student of Eduart Reuss, Karl Heinrich Graf (1815-1869), although it was first fully expounded and popularized during the succeeding decades by Julius Wellhausen.

(1) Graf's Hypothesis.--The great contribution of Graf was to introduce into German scholarship a detailed proof of the thesis which Reuss had propounded on the basis of intuition alone: that the cultic law of the middle books of the Pentateuch must be later than Deuteronomy and the historical books.[75] In his study, Graf takes the discovery of the Deuteronomic Code by Josiah as a fixed point. Then, through close comparison of Deuteronomy with other legal materials in the Pentateuch, he concludes that we must date the Pentateuchal laws to the time of Ezra.[76]

---

[75] *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1866), pp. 4f.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

As an example of the external evidence for the late date of Pentateuchal legislation, Graf cites the account of the tabernacle (Ex. 25:1-31:11; 35:4-40), which is closely associated with the priestly law: such an object is never mentioned in the historical books before the Chronicler. He also cites Amos 5:25 and Jer. 7:22f. to support his contention that no sacrificial laws had been part of the Mosaic legislation. According to Graf, the late date of the cultic legislation is one of the clearest facts about the Pentateuch; only because this did not fit with prevailing theories was the evidence overlooked. The designation of the Priestly narrative and laws as the Urschrift had made a true evaluation of that material impossible.[77]

Graf himself ran into difficulties at this point, for he ended by separating Priestly narrative from Priestly law, continuing to regard the former as part of the oldest narrative matter in the Pentateuch. His scheme of development was accordingly:

1. The narrative portions of the Priestly document;
2. The Covenant Code in writing by the 10th-9th

---

[77] *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

century;

3. The work of the Yahwist (8th century), incorporating early legal matter such as the Covenant Code;
4. The book of Deuteronomy, based on J;
5. The legal code of Lev. 17-26, associated with Ezekiel;
6. The Priestly legal matter of Leviticus and Numbers, from the time of Ezra.[78]

Other scholars were quick to point out the impossibility of separating the Priestly narrative from the Priestly legal materials. Two years after the publication of Graf's book, a young Dutch scholar, Abraham Kosters, criticized Graf's work in a dissertation, Die Historie-Beschouwing van den Deuteronomist met de Berichten in Genesis-Numeri Vergeleken.[79] Kosters accused Graf of the same adherence to tradition of which Graf had accused his predecessors. "Wat geeft echter aan Graf het recht deze stukken (sc. the Priestly narratives) zooverre van de wetgeving te verwijderen en ze te plaatsen aan het begin der Pentateuchische literatur? Blijkbaar staat hij hier onder de macht der traditie."[80] Kosters compared the narratives of Deuteronomy with those of the Priestly author and the Yahwist, and showed that the Deuteronomist knew the narratives of the Yahwist, but not those of the Priestly writer ("Elohist"). The conclusion was that the priestly narratives, like the laws, must be later than the other Pentateuchal sources.[81]

---

[78] Ibid., pp. 29, 81. [79] (Leyden, 1868).

In the same year a review of Graf's work by E. Riehm appeared in _Theologische Studien und Kritiken_.[82] Riehm pointed out that Graf could not thus separate Priestly narrative from the laws, for the two types of material presupposed each other. For example the story of the covenant of circumcision in Gen. 17 is a narrative expression of the priestly law concerning circumcision. Riehm further criticized the assumption that practically no laws existed before the time of Ezra (an assumption which must go back to Vatke); sacrifice, for example, must have been carried on according to some set of regulations from the time of settlement in Canaan.[83]

---

[80] _Op. cit._, p. 135.

[81] _Ibid._, p. 134.

[82] _Theologische Studien und Kritiken_, Vol. 41 (1868), pp. 350-79.

When the same objections were pointed out to Graf by the Dutch scholar Kuenen, Graf admitted the strength of these arguments and said he had been wrong in regarding the Priestly source as the Grundschrift.[84] The Grafian theory, as corrected by Kosters, Kuenen, and Riehm, was now applied to the text of the Hexateuch in detail by Julius Wellhausen.

(2) Wellhausen's synthesis.--In a series of studies appearing in the Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie, Wellhausen worked through the Hexateuch in meticulous detail.[85] He assigned material to Q (his term for the Priestly matter, from Latin quattuor, for the "four covenants"), to J, to E, to D, and to redactors. Wellhausen especially concerned himself with the way in which the redactors appeared to have combined the three main sources, JEP. Accepting

---

[83] Ibid., p. 368.

[84] Cf. A. Kuenen, The Religion of Israel (London, 1874), Vol. II, p. 292 (trans. by A. H. May from the Dutch Godsdienst von Israel).

[85] J. Wellhausen, "Die Composition des Hexateuchs: I-II," JDT XXI (1876), pp. 392-450, 531-602; "III," JDT XXII (1877), pp. 407-479. This series was later expanded into a monograph, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments (Berlin: 1889).

Hupfeld's separation of "E" from the Priestly material, Wellhausen attempted to clarify the organization implicit in the original sources and the theology reflected by each.

In Wellhausen's view J, the Yahwistic work, was the basis of the narrative. To this E had been added by a redactor, and this JE corpus was in turn combined with the P material by a priestly redactor.[86] The supplement hypothesis was decisively rejected: J, E, and "Q" were originally independent narratives reaching from Genesis through Joshua.[87]

Wellhausen summed up his whole solution this way:

> Aus J und E ist JE zusammengeflossen und mit JE das Deuteronomium verbunden; ein selbständiges Werk daneben ist Q. Erweitert zum Priestercodex ist Q mit JE + Dt. vereinigt und daraus der Hexateuch enstanden. Der Einfachkeit wegen abstrahire ich meistens davon, dass der literarische Process in Werksamkeit complicirter gewesen ist und die sogennante Ergänzungshypothese in untergeordneter Weise doch ihre Anwendung findet. J und E haben wohl erst mehrere vermehrte Ausgaben (J^1, J^2, J^3, E^1, E^2, E^3) erlebt und sind nicht als J^1 und E^1, sondern als J^3 und E^3 zusammengearbeitet; aehnliches gilt von JE, Dt., und Q, bevor sie mit den betreffenden grösseren Ganzen vereinigt wurden. Doch bin ich davon überzeugt, dass abgesehen von Deuteronomium nur drei selbständige und den zusammenhang vollständig darstellende Schriften anzunehmen sind, J und E und Q.[88]

---

[86] Op. cit., JDT XXI, p. 407.

[87] Ibid., p. 531.

[88] Ibid., JDT XXII, p. 478.

In his famous Prolegomena Wellhausen combined this source criticism with a view of the history of Israel's religious development which has much in common with Vatke, De Wette, and especially with Ewald. As in Vatke's work the Mosaic theocracy is not the beginning but the end of Israel's religious and political development, and the years between the Conquest and the Exile are fraught with the conflict between natural religion and the high ethical monotheism of the prophets. As in Ewald, the J and E sources show the influence of prophecy, P (Q) the voice of Law:

> We can trace first of all the influence on the tradition of that specific prophetism which we are able to follow from Amos onwards. This is least traceable in the old main source of the Jehovist, in J; and yet it is remarkable that the Asheras never occur in the worship of the patriarchs. The second Jehovistic source, E, breathes the air of the prophets much more markedly, and shows a more advanced and thorough-going religiosity. Significant in this view are the introduction of Abraham as a Nabi, Jacob's burying the teraphim, the view taken of the maççeba at Shechem (Jos. xxiv. 27), and above all the story of the golden calf. The Deity appears less primitive than in J, and does not approach men in bodily form, but calls to them from heaven, or appears to them in dreams. The religious element has become more defined, but at the same time more energetic, and has laid hold even of elements heterogeneous to itself, producing on occasion such strange mixtures as that in Gen. xxxi. 10-13. Then the law comes in and leavens the Jehovistic narrative, first the Deuteronomic (in Genesis even, and then quite strongly in Exodus and Joshua), while last of all, in the Priestly Code, under the influence of the legislation of the post-exilic restoration, there is brought about a

> complete metamorphosis even of the narrative of the Priestly Code. All the distinctive peculiarities of the work are connected with the influence of the law; everywhere we hear the voice of theory, rule, and judgment.[89]

Wellhausen's summary has been quoted at some length because it states clearly what came to be part of the "assured results" of 19th-century Pentateuchal criticism, both with regard to the dating and contents of the sources, and with regard to the religious history of Israel seen reflected in them.

Credited by Wellhausen with having done the most for the further development of the new documentary hypothesis,[90] the Dutch scholar Abraham Kuenen set forth the following scheme of the development of the Pentateuch:

1. The Yahwistic document (J) was composed in the north-Israelite kingdom within the 9th century or at the beginning of the 8th;
2. The Elohistic document (E) was written, in the northern kingdom as well, by an author who was

---

[89] Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, trans. by Black and Menzies from the second German edition of 1878 (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 361.

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

acquainted with J, and who must have lived about 750 B.C.;

3. Both J and E were so expanded and recast that in the second half of the 7th century distinctively Judean editions of these works had come into existence;
4. At some period later than 650 B.C. the documents J and E, thus supplemented and worked over, were combined;
5. The Deuteronomic redactor who reduced the two proto-Deuteronomic works (Kuenen's D_1 and D_2) to one work recast the account of Israel's settlement in Canaan in his own spirit. But it was only the book of Joshua and the accounts of the last activities and death of Moses that underwent such drastic treatment. In Gen.-Num. the redactor confined himself to adding a few touches;
6. When the Jewish exiles returned to their fatherland the Deuteronomico-prophetic book JED may have existed in the same form in which it was united with the priestly codex some centuries

later.[91]

Though some scholars would take issue with details of dating or provenance, or with further division of sources (J_1, J_2, etc.), the theory in its basic form was almost unanimously accepted. The summaries of Cornill,[92] W. R. Smith,[93] and Holzinger[94] all give essentially the same picture, as does the influential publication of J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby.[95]

(III) The Description of the E Source by Literary Criticism

We shall now turn to some of the influential studies of the Hexateuch for a more detailed description of the

---

[91] Abraham Kuenen, An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, trans. by Philip H. Wicksteed from the 2d Dutch edition of Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar de Boeken des Oudes Verbonds (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886), pp. 248-70.

[92] Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des AT (Tübingen, 1913).

[93] The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (London, 1892), pp. 423ff.

[94] Einleitung in den Hexateuch (Freiburg, 1893), pp. 72-228.

[95] The Hexateuch, 2 Vols. (London, 1900), pp. 110-120.

Elohistic work. Our English authorities will be the works of W. R. Smith and J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby mentioned above, as well as the famous Introduction of S. R. Driver and the recent Introduction of Robert Pfeiffer. From the German we cite the Einleitungen of Cornill and Eissfeldt and the mentioned works of Wellhausen.

(A) Contents, Characteristics, Provenance

According to Eissfeldt, the four primary criteria for identifying the various sources of the Pentateuch were: (1) Differences in the use of the divine names; (2) The existence of double accounts of the same event, contradictions, interruptions in the narrative, and later additions; (3) Differences in religious and moral views and in historical and geographical background; (4) Differences in language, style, and nomenclature.[96] (It may be noted that this methodology is little different from that proposed by Eichhorn in 1787.)[97] It should be useful to organize our description of the findings about E in terms of these categories of Eissfeldt.

---

[96] Eissfeldt, Einleitung (2d ed.), pp. 216-223.

[97] See above, p. 11.

(1) The E source is distinguished from the J by its use of *Elohim* in the Genesis narratives. After the E account of the revelation of the name *Yahweh* in Ex. 3, the Elohist occasionally uses *Yahweh* as well, but still seems to prefer *Elohim*.[98]

(2) The E narrative extends from Gen. 15 to Josh. 24, thus like J presenting the history of the people of Israel from the Patriarchs to the conquest of Canaan. Unlike J, however, E has no Primeval History.[99] E parallels J's story of Abraham and Sarah at Gerar (Gen. 20), tells of the expulsion of Hagar (Gen. 21:8-21; cf. Gen. 16, J) and the covenant with Abimelech (21:22-34; cf. Gen. 26:23-33, J), but adds something not paralleled in J with the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22:1-14, 19).

Again E parallels J in the stories of the rivalry of Jacob and Esau, Jacob's theophany at Bethel, the marriages of Jacob and his relations with Laban (Gen. 27; 28:11-12, 17-18, 20-21; 29-32; the narrative is composite and impossible to unravel satisfactorily).[100]

---

[98] Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 34, 38; Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, first pub. 1897 (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), pp. 13-19.

[99] Cf. Kuenen, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-59; O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 89-108; Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-19; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 110-111; R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), pp. 168-71, for the content of E.

Now E concentrates on the fortunes of Joseph; E parallels J in Gen. 37; 39-43; 45-50. After the death of Joseph the narrative passes on to the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt, followed by stories of the birth of Moses and his commission (Ex. 1:15-21; 2:1-10; 3:1-22).[101]

The same general plan is followed by both J and E with regard to the events of the Exodus and Sinai, relating the escape from Egypt (fragmentarily preserved in Ex. 14; 15), the journey to Horeb (Ex. 16:4; 17:1b-16; 18:1-27; Horeb is E's name for the mountain designated "Sinai" in J and P). At Horeb the covenant is concluded with the "covenant words" (20:22-26) as the covenant law.[102]

---

[100] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 43; Driver, op. cit., p. 16.

[101] Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 169; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 174.

[102] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 112-114; Driver (op. cit., p. 39) is more cautious about the minute analysis of the JE narrative of Ex. 19-24; 32-34 into "J" and "E."

After the covenant ceremony (Ex. 24:3-8)[103] Moses and Joshua ascend the mountain to receive tablets of stone, and descend later to find rebellion and idolatry in the camp (Ex. 32:1-35).[104] This apostasy led to the institution of the Tent of Meeting (Ex. 33:7-11), the description of its construction having apparently been withdrawn in favor of P's longer and more elaborate account.[105]

In the period of the wilderness wandering, E presents two scenes which illustrate the Elohist's conception of the prophetic gift and the eminence of Moses (Num. 11:24-30; 12:1-15).[106] In the subsequent narrative E runs side by side with J: the mission of the spies (E fragmentary in Num. 13);[107] the revolt of Dathan and Abiram (fragmentary in Num. 16);[108] the request for permission to pass through Edom (Num. 21:13-22a);[109] the overthrow of Sihon (Num. 21: 11b-31);[110] the visit of Balaam to Balak (Ch. 22 and parts of 23);[111] the Israelite worship of Baal Peor (Num. 25:1-5 in part or the whole).[112]

---

[103] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, Vol. I, p. 276. Again Driver refuses more than a provisional analysis; *op. cit.*, p.32.

[104] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 276; Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 38; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

[105] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 111.

[106] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 111; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[107] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, pp. 111, 277. Driver(op. cit., p. 62) calls Ch. 13 "JE," as does Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

According to most commentators, Dt. 30-34 contained narratives originally part of the J and E histories. The E sections of these chapters are held to include the charge to Joshua (Dt. 31:14, 23),[113] the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33, in part),[114] and finally a brief mention of Moses' death and burial in Moab (Dt. 34:5).[115]

---

[108] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 277; while Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 64) and Pfeiffer (*op. cit.*, p. 171) designate the story as "JE."

[109] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 277; while Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 64) designates this passage "JE." Pfeiffer (*op. cit.*, p. 171) seems to regard it as E, except perhaps for v. 19.

[110] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 277; Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 66, designates "JE"; Pfeiffer assigns these verses to E (*op. cit.*, p. 171).

[111] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 277. Driver assigns 22:2-41 "with some confidence" to E (*op. cit.*, p. 66). Pfeiffer says the passage is "usually assigned to E" (*op. cit.*, p. 171.).

[112] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 277; Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 67, assigns to "JE," and similarly Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

[113] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 278; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

It had long been a commonplace of Pentateuchal criticism to associate the Book of Joshua with the first five books, assigning them to common sources (cf. Geddes in 1792; see above, p. 14). This was done even before the name "Hexateuch" came into common use. Accordingly, followers of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis assign narratives in Joshua to "JE," while admitting that it is often impossible to separate the two strands.[116]

(3) In its religious interests, E is marked by a threefold scheme of history of revelation: (a) The forefathers

---

[114] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 278. Neither Driver (p. 98) nor Pfeiffer (p. 280) connect any part of Dt. 33 with E. But Weiser (Introduction to the OT, trans. from his Einleitung in das AT, 4th ed. /Göttingen, 1957/ by Dorothea M. Barton /London, 1961/, p. 117), describes Dt. 33 as "a separate composition taken up into the E strand."

[115] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., I, p. 278. Driver (p. 72) and Pfeiffer (p. 133) call this passage "JE." Eissfeldt, Einleitung, p. 239, finds E present in Dt. 31; 34 at least fragmentarily.

[116] Cf. Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, II, p. 279. According to Pfeiffer (p. 302), "The E story of the Conquest of Canaan is told in the first half of the Book of Joshua," but it is "futile" to try to determine exactly which parts of the narrative are E. Kuenen (op. cit., pp. 142, 155-59) is quite dubious about the presence of E in Josh. 1-12; 24.

beyond the River were idolators (Josh. 24:35); (b) Abraham, however, is a prophet (נביא),[117] and consciously follows the will of God. Jacob likewise refuses idolatry, though only after a vision of Elohim's angels. (c) Finally; the revelation of the Divine name Yahweh to Moses completes the process of revelation.[118]

There is a corresponding change in the form and manner of divine revelation as compared to J. E is less anthropomorphic than J, for God appears only by means of dreams, visions, or angelic intermediaries.[119] God's closest communion is with Moses, who actually sees his form (Num. 12:8). Like Abraham before him, Moses is a prophet to whom God reveals himself. The prophetic function as displayed in Abraham, Moses, Miriam, and the seventy elders is the ideal goal of Israel's development as a people.[120] Thus the Elohist presents a history which is less the story of Yahweh's mighty acts than a religious history of the people of Israel--even in a sense the history of prophecy in Israel. Eissfeldt stresses the importance of the prophetic judgment upon Israel which is implicitly pronounced in such stories as Ex. 32; in the threat of Ex. 32:34 the judgment is explicit and unequivocal. The Elohist is not only interested in prophecy, but writes from a prophetic standpoint.[121]

---

[117] Gen. 20:7, the first use of the term in the OT history.

[118] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 112.

[119] *Ibid.*, I, p. 112. Eissfeldt describes E as less anthropomorphic than J: *Die Genesis der Genesis* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958), p. 30.

[120] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 112.

(4) The peculiarities of style and nomenclature of the various sources, as literary criticism catalogued them, are given in considerable detail by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby and by Driver.[122] According to these lists, some of the most characteristic and certain of the peculiarities of E's language are the use of "Horeb" for Sinai,[123] "Amorites" for the original inhabitants of Canaan,[124] and

---

[121] Einleitung, pp. 237-39.

[122] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 185-200; S. R. Driver, op. cit., pp. 116-159. Cf. also the excellent tables of Holzinger, op. cit., pp. 93-110, 177, 181-91.

[123] Ex. 3:1; 4:27; 17:6; 18:5; 24:13; 33:6.

[124] Gen. 15:16; 48:22; Num. 13:29; 21:13, 21, 31. But see below, p. 138, n. 93.

the word אמה for "maidservant."[125] The E narratives use the expression "after these things" (אחר הדברים האלה) to introduce a story,[126] and in theophanic accounts God repeats the name of the patriarch or leader twice, to which the latter responds "Here I am" (הנני).[127]

Some words which are used many times in E reflect peculiar interests rather than usage: שרת "to minister,"[128] העלה "to offer,"[129] התפלל "to pray, intercede,"[130] נביא "prophet,"[131] התנבא "to prophesy,"[132] נסה "to test," or "prove," with the Deity as subject.[133]

---

[125] Gen. 20:17; 21:10, 12, 13; 31:3, 31:33; Ex. 2:5; 20:10, 17; 21:7, 20, 26, 32; 23:12. But see below, pp. 101f.

[126] Gen. 15:1; 22:1; 39:7; 40:1; 48:1; Josh. 24:29.

[127] Gen. 22:11; Ex. 3:4; Gen. 46:2.

[128] Gen. 39:4; 40:4; Ex. 24:13; 33:11; Num. 11:28; Josh. 1:1.

[129] Gen. 22:2, 13; Ex. 24:5; 32:6; Num. 23:2, 4, 14, 30.

[130] Gen. 20:7, 17; Num. 11:2; 21:7.

[131] Gen. 20:7; Ex. 15:20; Num. 11:29; 12:6.

[132] Num. 11:25, 26, 27.

[133] Gen. 22:1; Ex. 15:23; 16:4; 20:20; Dt. 33:8.

(B) Provenance

It is generally agreed by the literary critics that E is to be assigned to the Northern Kingdom. The interests of the northern tribes seem to prevail; Bethel, Shechem, and Beer-Sheba are the patriarchal santuaries (the latter being connected with the North by Amos' mention of it as a pilgrimage center for eighth-century Israelites, Amos 8:14). Reuben is the leader of the eleven brothers in the Joseph stories. Joshua is an Ephraimite. The graves of the famous dead are in the North.[134]

(C) Date

As to its date, E evidences a period of national prosperity. Abraham has a parity covenant with Abimelech; the blessing of Jacob by Isaac emphasizes future prosperity; Joseph dreams of future sovereignty of his house over the rest of the tribes. An elaborate judicial organization is reflected in Ex. 18. The same picture of national prosperity is seen in the Balaam oracles and the Conquest narratives. The Gileadite covenant between Jacob and Laban reflects an era of peace with Aram.[135] At the same time there is danger of idolatry (Josh. 24:15), although the conflict with foreign gods has not become acute as in, for example, Hosea or even Amos.[136]

---

[134] E is attributed to a northern author by Cornill (*op. cit.*, pp. 44-45) and by Carpenter & Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 116). Eissfeldt (*Einleitung*, pp. 241-42) questions the above arguments, stressing the unity of the old epic traditions. Procksch, (*Die Elohimquelle*, pp. 175-204) argues at length for the Northern provenance of E. Cf. also Kuenen, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

Most scholars have concluded that the above conditions of peace, prosperity, interest in prophecy, and more or less advanced religious ideas point to the 8th century as the time of composition. The prosperity reflected is identified as that of the reign of Jeroboam II (786-746), while the prophetic interest and religious conceptions indicate association with the early stages of the 8th-century prophetic movement.[137]

---

[135] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, I, p. 116; Procksch, op. cit., pp. 178-80.

[136] Cf. especially Procksch, op. cit., pp. 175-203, for a detailed argument placing E between Elijah and Amos.

[137] E is dated in the 8th century by Carpenter & Harford-Battersby (I, pp. 118-19); Cornill (op. cit., p. 52); Eissfeldt, (op. cit., p. 241); Pfeiffer (op. cit., p. 168); Driver (op. cit., pp. 123-24); Kuenen (op. cit., p. 248). In fact, agreement on this dating is practically unanimous among the older scholars. Recently, more scholars have left open the possibility of a date considerably earlier: M. Noth, Exodus: A Commentary, trans. J. S. Bowden from the German Das Zweite Buch Mose, Exodus (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1962), pp. 15-16; O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 241; A Weiser, op. cit., pp. 124-25.

(D) Dissenting Opinions

Matters of scholarly criticism cannot be decided by majority vote. Consequently we must pay due regard to studies of the E source which have produced results at variance with the commonly held views described above. (In our next chapter we shall discuss current dissent from the literary critical solution more fully.)

Like Kuenen, O. Procksch identified two E sources, deriving from prophetic schools half a century apart: E_1, or the Grundschrift, written in the reign of Jeroboam II, and which models the prophetic figures of Abraham and Moses on the figure of Elijah; and E_2, written about 700 and displaying contact with the popular group-prophets, as in the description of the prophesying of the seventy elders, Num. 11.[138]

More recently Pfeiffer, while accepting the unity of "E" and its 8th-century dating and northern provenance, decisively rejects the idea that E is peculiarly interested in prophecy or comes out of a prophetic school. Rather, says Pfeiffer, E's pervasive interest in ritual shows the author to be "a priest, presumably at Bethel."[139] The type of prophecy represented by the 8th-century reformers Amos and Hosea is in no way reflected, and would in fact be inimical to the interests of the priestly author. However, there is some sympathy in E for the older type of prophecy which was connected with the revolt of Jehu in the time of Elijah and Elisha. Therefore E can present Abraham and Moses as prophets in this earlier sense.

---

[138] *Op. cit.*, pp. 195ff. [139] *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

Pfeiffer also denies the implication that E is more advanced theologically than J because of his lack of anthropomorphism. Rather it is the purpose of the Elohist to exalt Moses above all others as one to whom God spoke face to face; other revelations must be correspondingly lessened by limiting them to dreams and visions. In fact Pfeiffer can finally describe E as "a collection of legends leading up to the conclusion 'And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face.'"[140]

Although we do not agree with Pfeiffer's approach in general, we believe that his questioning of the standard description of E is valuable in both areas discussed. That is, the ordinary description of E as "prophetic" must be looked into more closely, and the assumption that revelation through dreams means a late date needs re-examination (see below, Ch. IV).

---

[140] Ibid., p. 175.

Significant disagreement also arose very early concerning the date of E. In the English edition of his History of the Hebrews, Rudolph Kittel reversed the commonly accepted sequence J, E and dated E earlier than J. In his view, E preserves a number of traditions in a form which is earlier than the J form. At the same time Kittel rejected the arguments that E is later because of the author's avoidance of anthropomorphism and his emphasis on the supernatural. These tendencies are explained by Kittel rather as the product of a "more religiously disposed mind," in contrast to the Yahwist, who is steeped in ways of thought and speech that belonged to the populace.[141]

In the matter of prophetic influence, Kittel finds J's presentation to be more profoundly influenced by prophetic ideas than E's, although E betrays close contact with early prophecy. He concludes that J is to be dated no earlier than 830 B.C., and E considerably earlier, possibly about the time of the division of the Kingdom.[142]

---

[141] R. Kittel, History of the Hebrews, trans. J. Taylor (London, 1895), Vol. I, p. 80.

Kittel's argument is partly based on a different analysis of the contents of the sources, for he would assign to J certain passages which Wellhausen thought "too prophetic" to be J, considering them redactional.[143] It is also based on the somewhat weak ground that E is northern and therefore earlier, simply because we should expect history to be written earlier in the Northern Kingdom than in Judah.[144]

While questioning Kittel's arguments, we must express approval of his early dating of E. Once the characteristic interests of this tradition are seen in their true light, and once the contents and form of the traditions are properly evaluated, the standard 8th-century dating of E is seen to be much too late. (See below, Ch. IV).

Conclusion

In the 150 years following the work of Astruc, scholars discovered both the underlying structure of the Pentateuch and the vast variety of traditions from various early sources which had been woven into the final fabric. Scholars also developed, during this century and one-half, the conceptual scheme by which the history of Israel's literature could be related to an evolving religion and society. All this represents a striking achievement, especially when one considers the level of discussion prior to the 19th century.

---

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[143] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[144] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Nevertheless, we have come to see the weaknesses in this scholarly achievement as well. The separation of the various threads which make up the fabric of the Pentateuch was carried on with little regard for the ways in which ancient peoples transmitted their sacred traditions, and the evolutionary scheme of Israel's religious history imposed a unilinear development on a process which was in reality vastly more complex and tangled. To the extent that scholars failed on these points, the accepted description of E and of the other sources is weakened. In the next chapter we shall consider the development of criticism from 1900 to the present, with particular emphasis on the ways in which the first literary critics' conclusions and presuppositions have been attacked, and these weaknesses assailed.

CHAPTER II

TOWARD A NEW VIEW OF E: CRITICISM FROM 1900 TO THE PRESENT

It is not our aim in this chapter to review the entire development of Pentateuchal criticism since the turn of the 20th century.[1] We will attempt instead to concentrate on those aspects of developing modern criticism which appear to offer promise for a new and more accurate evaluation of the E tradition. The approach which we will take, therefore, will be more thematic than chronological. We will consider first the significant effect of form-criticism upon Pentateuchal studies, and specifically upon scholars' understanding of E.

---

[1] Some of the most helpful reviews are: J. Coppens, The Old Testament and the Critics, trans. from the French by E. A. Ryan and E. Tribbe (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942); C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 48-83; H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., pp. 399-416; J. Bright, "Modern Study of Old Testament Literature," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. G. E. Wright (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 13-31. A number of articles by G. Ernest Wright should also be mentioned as particularly useful: "Recent European Study in the Pentateuch," JBR, Vol. XVIII (1950), pp. 216-225; "Old Testament Scholarship in Prospect," JBR XXIII (1960), pp. 182-93; "Cult and History: A Study of a Current Problem in Old Testament Interpretation," Interpretation XVI (1962), pp. 3-20; "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," Expository Times LXXI (July, 1960), pp. 3-7.

(A) The Impact of Form Criticism

We have seen that Wellhausen himself, in picturing the composition of the Pentateuch, had allowed for a long process of writing, rewriting, expansion, and even for the continuing influence of oral tradition.[2] But later Wellhausenists had tended more and more to view the sources as true written documents produced by one author at one time. Any later additions which were perceived were commonly attributed to the shadowy JE redactor.[3]

The most significant break in this rather academically oriented view of the growth of Israelite literature came with the publication, in 1902, of Hermann Gunkel's brilliant commentary on Genesis.[4] Gunkel grasped the central importance of the relation of ancient literature to the life of the people, and in so doing laid the groundwork for many of the most creative achievements of 20th century Biblical criticism. The traditional history of Israel's beginnings, Gunkel saw, had not emerged full-blown from the pen of an author or even a group of authors, but had first grown up and been transmitted orally in the life of the people, whether in the cultus or around the campfire.[5]

---

[2] See above, p. 37.

[3] Cf. Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 171-79.

[4] Genesis übersetzt und erklärt, HKAT (2d. ed., Göttingen, 1902).

The key to the unravelling of the earlier stages of the Pentateuchal traditions, according to Gunkel, was a close study of the forms or Gattungen in which oral traditions were preserved. Often these forms would be the same as the forms found in the literature of other cultures; occasionally both form and content owed much to foreign sources. Thus the findings and methods of the new religionsgeschichtliche Schule, which was opening the world of the ancient Orient to Western scholars, could be drawn upon by the Pentateuchal critic.[6]

In his Genesis commentary, Gunkel looked behind the present written stage of the narratives--and even behind the so-called "documents"--to find two even earlier stages of tradition. In the first stage, these *Sagen* were drawn together into *Sammlungen* or collections, usually centering around one character or a pair of characters in the stories. All this took place before the creation of J or E, which drew together many such collections of *Sagen* into unified epic narratives.[7]

---

[5] H. Gunkel, op. cit., pp. LII-LXXI.

[6] Cf. H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., pp. 309-320, 329-334.

In his analysis of the rise of J and E, Gunkel placed much more emphasis on the earlier collections of *Sagen* than on the creative work of the "authors" of sources. The "authors" themselves were viewed primarily as "collectors" who took over the already existing groups of *Sagen*.

> Die Sagen des E und noch mehr des J *nicht den Charakter bestimmten einzelnen Zeit*, geschweige denn einer Einzelpersönlichkeit tragen, sondern sie von den Sammlern im wesentlichen so übernommen sind, wie sie sie vorfanden.[8]

In the sources J and E, materials from very early periods stand side by side with later material. Thus, by implication, the efforts of literary critics to locate and date the origin of the sources must be based on the general background reflected in the various traditions, and on the theological emphases apparent in Traditionssammlungen, rather than on single geographical or political-historical references.

---

[7] H. Gunkel, *op. cit.*, pp. LXXI-LXXXI.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. LXXII.

His analysis of the form and content of individual narratives demonstrated for Gunkel the independence of J and E. Sometimes he found the older form of a story in E, as in E's Joseph narrative, where Reuben is the protagonist of the eleven brothers, while J modernizes and replaces the no longer existing Reuben tribe with Judah. More often, Gunkel believed, J had the older form of a story, as in the Jacob-Laban cycle where Jacob's narrative is much less wordy and more naively stated than E's. Similarly, in the J narrative the magical effects of the mandrakes are spoken of without embarrassment, whereas E makes the story illustrate the gracious power of God (Gen. 30:14ff.). The important point is that such examples demonstrate the independent evolution of J and E from a related common body of early traditions.[9]

Gunkel retained the traditional 8th-century dating of E, but this date had much less significance in his view, for the final writing down of this body of traditions was simply the culmination of a long period of collection and sifting of oral and written traditions.[10] The long editorial process was more important for understanding the history of the tradition than the date which would be fixed as the *terminus ad quem* of the process.

---

[9] Ibid., p. LXXXIII.

What Gunkel had done in his Genesis commentary was carried on by his student, Hugo Gressmann, in a study of the Moses traditions, *Mose und seine Zeit*.[11] Like Gunkel, Gressmann came to view J and E as collections of traditions rather than unitary documents. "Zu einer befriedigenden Erklärung des Tatbestandes wird man nur gelangen, wenn man JE für Redaktoren oder Sammler hält."[12] Gressmann was led to this conclusion, as was Gunkel, by the lack of complete unity of style and conception within J and E. Instead of theorizing a multitude of different written documents (J_1, J_2, E_1, E_2, etc.) Gressmann followed Gunkel in picturing the "authors" of the sources as editors of already-formed complexes of tradition. Still adhering to the theory of E's independence from J, Gressmann also set *ca.* 750 B.C. as the possible terminus for the final form of E.[13]

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. LXXX.

[11] (Göttingen, 1913).

[12] H. Gressmann, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 373.

What are the results of the Gunkel-Gressmann approach to the Pentateuchal traditions? First, the discarding of the too purely literary method of previous critics in favor of a more living, dynamic view of the evolution of the sacred traditions. J and E were no longer viewed as documents, but as collections of traditions reflecting at every point of their evolution the on-going life of the people of Israel. Secondly, as a corollary, questions of absolute date and individual authorship receded as the collections of traditions are seen in relation to a long process of history, reflecting the work of many minds and memories. At the most we can speak, Gunkel said, of "schools of tradition." Finally, Gunkel's approach meant that the stylistic peculiarities of individual authors could not be expected in the Pentateuchal sources. Instead we find only the sorts of characteristic words and phrases which reflect the usage of a school or circle of traditions, and perhaps of a particular region in ancient Israel.[14]

It was perhaps inevitable that when authors and documents were disposed of, as by Gunkel and Gressmann, the sources symbolized by "J" and "E" could not long survive.

---

[14] H. Gunkel, _op_. _cit_., pp. LXXV-LXXVI.

The disappearance of J and E as independent written sources is precisely what we encounter in the Scandinavian successors of Gunkel, Johannes Pedersen and Ivan Engnell.

(B) The Disappearance of Separate Sources

In his *Israel: Its Life and Culture, I-II*, published in English in 1926, Johannes Pedersen first suggested that it was frequently not possible to separate J from E in the Pentateuch.[15] This was only a mild prelude to his published rejection, in 1931, of the whole literary-critical construction by means of which most modern scholars had understood the Old Testament.[16] Included in this abandoned structure was, of course, the Documentary Hypothesis of Pentateuchal origins.

Pedersen's main point was the close association of the Wellhausenist theory with 19th-century Hegelian evolutionism--an association which makes the entire structure untenable, once the Hegelianism that supported it is rejected. This Hegelian view of the evolution of religion as a neat, unilinear process must be rejected, Pedersen maintained, as a rationalistic, idealized schematization which has no relation to the actual development of religion in Israel or in any other people.

---

[15] (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 27.

[16] "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," ZAW XLIX (1931), pp. 161-181.

The careful source-analysis which was the glory of German scholarship in the 19th century must be viewed realistically as part of this rationalistic construction, Pedersen continued, and its severe limitations accepted:

> Die Betrachtung der israelitischen literarischen Quellen, welche seit der Mitte des XIX. Jhs. geltend gemacht worden ist, ist von der modernen Geschichtsforschung übernommen. Sie setzt voraus dass jedes Dokument zeitlich genau fixiert und sein Wert als Quelle genau abgegrenzt werden kann. Diese quellenkritische Methode hat ihre unzweifelhafte Bedeutung auch für das Altertum, wenn es sich darum handelt, Begebenheiten und äussere Tatsachen festzustellen; aber sie muss stark begrenzt werden, wenn es gilt, die Kultur eines Volkes zu beschreiben. Wenn wir darüber im klaren sind, werden wir auch sehen, dass die schöne Ausscheidung der verschiedenen Schichten der Quellen des Pentateuchs und ihre Verteilung auf bestimmt angegebene Zeitpunkte in historischer Hinsicht von problematischer Bedeutung ist.[17]

Later, in an article published in 1934, Pedersen applied his views more specifically to a particular set of Pentateuchal traditions, namely the Exodus-Passover complex in Ex. 1-15.[18] He viewed these traditions as the cult-legend of Passover, which had evolved out of the cultic celebration of Israel's historical experience of deliverance. The literary-critical method of source-analysis missed the essential meaning of these traditions, which arose and were elaborated over the course of centuries in the life and worship of Israel. "Das hier in aller Kürze wiedergegebene Festlegende kann kein rein literarisches Produkt vom spätem Ursprung sein."[19]

---

[17] J. Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom AT," pp. 174-75.

[18] Idem, "Passahfest und Passahlegende, " ZAW LII (1934), pp. 161-75.

Pedersen did not attempt to ignore the contradictions and variants among the traditions of the Exodus, but insisted that these simply pointed to a series of originally oral additions which grew up around the original nucleus. For example, with reference to the different depictions of the departure from Egypt in Ex. 13:17-19; 14:2-4, 5-7, 19, 21; Pedersen maintained " . . . auf verschiedene parallel laufende und durchgehende Erzählungen deuten sie nicht."[20] Pedersen especially objected to the attempts of literary critics to rate the different notices concerning the event at the Sea in terms of their historicity--the J source's east wind being the most "natural" and therefore the most "historical" and the earliest.

---

[19] Idem, "Passahfest und Passahlegende," p. 168.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

> Ist, wie oben gezeigt, die Grundlage der Quellenscheidung wenig fest, so ist es jedenfalls eine missliche Sache, in den alten Erzählungen das auszuscheiden, was mit unserer Naturauffassung nicht übereinstimmt, und dadurch einen "natürlichen" Bericht zu schaffen, den man darnach für "historisch" erklärt. Eine genauere Betrachtung wird aber zeigen, dass der vermeintlich natürliche Bericht nicht so natürlich ist, wie man meint.[21]

In criticism of Pedersen it should be noted: (1) That Ex. 1-15, because of the intimate connection of Passover and Exodus, is the only portion of the Pentateuch which shows such clear signs of use as a "cult legend." The same analysis could hardly be applied to Gen. 12-50. (2) The results of source-critical analysis can be called into question much more easily in Ex. 1-15 than in other parts of the Pentateuch, especially Genesis. In favor of Pedersen, we can comment: (1) That the association between the Documentary Hypothesis and Hegelianism needed to be pointed out, and Hegelian-influenced ideas of religious evolution questioned in the light of new knowledge; (2) That source-analysis must be limited to its proper sphere--the study of the literature once it has become literature--and not used as a vehicle for presenting our view of the cultural and ideological history of Israel.[22]

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

Like Pedersen, the Swedish scholar Ivan Engnell begins by mounting a thoroughgoing attack on the philosophical presuppositions that governed the work of Wellhausenist critics. "The whole literary-critical system," writes Engnell, "rests upon a complete misunderstanding of the real conditions of ancient Oriental political, cultural, and religious history. It represents a modern, anachronistic book-view, and is therefore an interpretation in modern categories, an *interpretatio europeica moderna.*"[23] Any appraisal of Old Testament literature which hopes for authentic understanding must discard such academic fantasies as "documents," "editors," and scissors-and-paste composition. Instead we must appreciate fully the profound and central importance of oral transmission in the development of the Biblical traditions.

Applied to the Pentateuch, this means that we cannot reckon with continuous narrative sources such as "J" and "E."

---

[22] Cf. A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1948), Vol. II, p. 63.

[23] Art. "Moseböckerna," in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, Ivan Engnell and Anton Fridrichsen, eds. (2 vols.; 2d. ed.; Stockholm: Nordiska Uppslagsböcker, 1963), Vol. II, Col. 155. Cf. C. North, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

These must be replaced by cycles or complexes of tradition, such as the Passover cult-legend of Ex. 1-15 and the Patriarchal narratives of Gen. 12-50, which stand as a preface to the Passover complex.[24] Within these complexes there are, to be sure, doublets and other signs of overlapping traditions, but these do not establish the existence of continuous strands.

How does Engnell deal with the literary-critical claim that the presence of continuous sources is proved by linguistic characteristics which accompany the parallels? Gen. 12:10-20, for example, is paralleled by a very similar story in Gen. 20:1-18. In the former, Yahweh is used; in the latter only Elohim appears. Engnell's reply seems to be that the variations in the use of various divine names is not sufficiently constant to make literary analysis possible on that basis alone. No source limits itself entirely to one divine name. To some extent the variations represent the theological and stylistic preferences of a single traditionist (as later claimed by Volz and Rudolph); to some extent they appear to be merely arbitrary. In any case, comparison with the LXX text and with variant Hebrew texts demonstrates that the present usage in the Masoretic text must be to a large extent the result of later editing. The other linguistic arguments of literary critics can find even less support, says Engnell, once the nature of oral transmission and the development of traditions is accurately evaluated.[25]

---

[24] As summarized in A. Bentzen, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 20-21.

As to the alleged theological characteristics of the sources, Engnell refuses to see anything in these arguments but the presuppositions of modern scholars. "In reality such 'criteria' rest upon nothing other than an a priori, evolutionistic way of looking at things, which goes hand in hand with and dictates the source-analysis."[26]

How are we to assess the success of Engnell's attack on the dominating structure of literary criticism? It is certainly legitimate to question, as Pedersen had previously done, the evolutionistic presuppositions of the founders of literary criticism, and also to raise questions about the overly academic description of ancient Israelite literary activity. This last point had already been well established by Gunkel, although he failed to break completely with the literary-critical method.

---

[25] Op. cit., col. 156-57; cf. North, op. cit., pp. 66f.

[26] Ibid., col. 157; cf. North, op. cit., p. 67.

Nevertheless, as we will attempt to show in the following chapter, there is more to the literary-critical position than Engnell would have us believe. There are in fact, especially in Genesis, narratives which are given in double accounts, and in which each account displays distinctive vocabulary elements and distinctive theological or religious emphases. These linguistic and theological constants (such as Elohim vs. Yahweh) are found throughout the Pentateuch in conjunction with contradictions and repetitions in the narratives. "The existing doublets," comments Aage Bentzen, "are linked together through ever-recurring constant elements of formal and material nature, even if we are not in all cases able to reconstruct strictly coherent narratives."[27] At the very least these constants lead us to say, in regard to E, that there is good evidence for the incorporation into the Pentateuch of a body of traditions which used the name Elohim, and which shared, as a central and inescapable feature, a definite interest in and close acquaintance with an early form of prophecy. While this is a good deal less than was said by older literary critics about E, it is a minimal statement in the light of the evidence.

---

[27] A. Bentzen, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 45.

Engnell's handling of the variations in divine names must also be criticized. First of all, Skinner in The Divine Names in Genesis had showed some time ago that the Septuagintal variants cannot be used to overthrow literary-critical findings.[28] Secondly, an important study by Robert G. Boling of the use of Yahweh and Elohim in the Psalter has demonstrated that Hebrew authors or tradition circles, like their Canaanite counterparts, could regularly employ one name as the preferential "A word" in the first line of a couplet and another name as the "B word" in the second line.[29] This explains the "Yahwistic Psalter" and the "Elohistic Psalter" as collections coming, respectively, from circles in which Yahweh or Elohim is the "A word." Boling's analysis does not directly explain the use of Yahweh by the Yahwist tradition and Elohim by the Elohistic tradition, but it suggests that the two could be products of tradition circles in which these names are current as preferred designations of the Deity, and at the same time explains how the other name could be used by either school as the less preferred designation.

---

[28] J. Skinner, The Divine Names in Genesis (London, 1914), p. 116; cf. C. North, op. cit., pp. 79f.

[29] Robert G. Boling, "Synonymous Parallelism in the Psalms," JSS, Vol. V: No. 3 (1960), pp. 221-255.

Finally, the claim that *Elohim* suggests a "more theological" and "abstract-cosmic" picture of God[30] sounds like the kind of modern Western theologizing which Engnell is attempting to exclude from the study of ancient Oriental literature. If *Elohim* had such theological connotations, as opposed to *Yahweh*, we simply have no evidence for it. The two names are regularly employed as A-word and B-word in the Elohistic Psalter, the reverse being true in the Yahwistic Psalter, but surely we cannot claim that the theological intent of the Psalmists changes with each half-verse. On the other hand, we have evidence that the use of this type of plural of "god" in speaking of one deity is very ancient in Semitic literature. The Canaanite city-lords whose correspondence with the 15th and 14th-century Pharaohs is preserved in the Amarna letters, flattered the Egyptian ruler with the address *ʾilanīya*, "my gods" or "my pantheon." The usage, as Albright suggests, may have been drawn from the cultic sphere, where a high-god was similarly addressed as "the totality of gods, the equivalent of the entire pantheon."[31]

---

[30] I. Engnell, *op. cit.*, col. 156; cf. North, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

We conclude, then, that the observations of Gunkel, Gressmann, Pedersen, and Engnell have made possible some very significant alterations in the literary-critical analysis of the Pentateuch and of E. Among the most positive contributions is the reminder that we must look to the life of the people and to their oral traditions for the living source of the Pentateuchal narratives, and must reckon with the continuing influence of oral tradition even after the crystallizing of traditions into writing has begun. Secondly, we must reckon with schools or circles of tradition rather than with individual authors, with editing and collecting rather than with creative writing. But we must still insist on the possibility of literary analysis of this now written literature, and on the importance of the undeniable constants, theological and stylistic, which distinguish the main collections of tradition.

---

[31] W. F. Albright, FSAC, p. 213.

(C) The Rejection of E as an Independent Source

During the last years of Gunkel's life, and coincident with the work of Pedersen and Engnell, another line of criticism was being carried forward which also led to the rejection of E as an independent narrative source. Using literary rather than form-criticism, Sigmund Mowinckel and Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph reached some of the same results that Engnell had reached through his emphasis on oral tradition: the rejection of the variations in the divine names and other linguistic "constants" as critical criteria, and a theory of Pentateuchal composition through a long process of somewhat random additions to an ancient nucleus.

(1) Mowinckel

In an article entitled "Der Ursprung der Bilʿamsage," published in 1930,[32] the Norwegian scholar Sigmund Mowinckel announced his break with the Wellhausenist analysis of E. Regarding "E" as simply a convenient symbol of a process, rather than a unitary document, Mowinckel asserted: (1) That there never was an independent "E document," with its own traditions about Israel's beginnings. (2) Instead, "E" signifies a long process of explanatory and corrective additions to the J epic, with a terminus ad quem in the Exilic period. In this process (here Mowinckel thoroughly agrees with his Scandinavian colleagues, Pedersen and Engnell), the development of oral rather than written traditions is primary:

---

[32] ZAW XLVIII (1930), pp. 233-271.

> So werden die einzelnen Erzählungen in E zu je recht verschiedenen Zeiten die endliche Form, in der sie der Elohist aufnahm, erhalten haben. Es ist überhaupt anzunehmen, dass die von ihm gebuchte Tradition schon früher einem festen mündlichen, von J gestützten Zusammenhang, etwa wie in den isländischen Sagas vor der Aufzeichnung derselben, bildete, innerhalb dessen der eine Erzähler diese, die andere jene Einzelsage anders erzählte und immer nach den Anschauungen und Verhältnissen der wechselnden Zeiten umbildete. "Der Elohist" ist der jenige, der nach dem Fall des Staates den ganzen schon zusammenhängenden Stoff in der ihm eigentümlichen Sprache aufzeichnete und **wohl** auch nach seinen Ideen dies oder jenes änderte, abglättete, strich, und der vielleicht auch die Erzählung über die letzte, unmittelbar vorhergehende Zeit selbständig konzipierte. -- Diese ganze Prozess ist es, den wir mit dem Idogramm "E" bezeichnen und abkürzen zusammenfassen.[33]

Mowinckel himself has applied his theories concerning the composition of the Pentateuch, and specifically concerning E, to only a few portions of the tradition.[34] It remained for the German scholars Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph, working both together and separately, to carry out a thorough-going analysis of the Hexateuch, attacking the solutions of the earlier literary-critics point by point. This they did in a series of publications which appeared in the 1930's.

---

[33] "Der Ursprung der Bilʿamsage," p. 271.

[34] In addition to the article cited above, n. 32, see his Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1937) and, recently, Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch, BZAW 90 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964).

(2) Volz and Rudolph

In a monograph entitled "Der Elohist als Erzähler ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?,"[35] of which Volz and Rudolph each wrote one part, the two scholars answered their own question with a resounding "Yes!" The documentary hypothesis developed in the Wellhausen school is a dogma, Volz says, which has concealed the Pentateuch from sensitive and realistic investigation. To support this claim, Volz makes the following points:

(1) The literary-critical method is "unnatural." The existence of two separate literary sources with almost the same contents (J and E) is improbable, and the type of editorial work attributed to the redactor of JE is incredible in ancient Israel, being rather the creation of 19th-century

---

[35] BZAW 63 (Giessen: A Töpelmann, 1933).

Privatdozenten. The ridiculous analysis that breaks up the Pentateuch into half-sentences and isolated words points up the un-naturalness of this method of approaching ancient literature.

(2) Literary criticism of the Pentateuch has made use of incorrect methods. For example, the supposed difference in the use of the names Yahweh and Elohim, and the use of "Horeb" in one context and "Sinai" in another, is simply the result of the one epic author's varied literary style, or of his faithful use of older traditions.

(3) There are better methods for solving the problem of literary relationships. The methods of criticism which have been applied to the prophetic books should be used on the Pentateuch as well: we should assume an original text by one author, with later additions and explanations being added over the course of centuries.[36]

(4) "The method of dividing into sources frequently and to a serious degree destroys the original unity and artistic beauty of the stories and of the entire narrative work."[37]

---

[36] Der Elohist als Erzähler, pp. 14-21.

[37] Ibid., p. 179.

On the positive side, Volz presents this theory: There is one basic connected narrative in the Pentateuch, the J epic. The J narrator himself is not so much an author as a collector of traditions. To his original work the rest of the Pentateuch was added over the course of centuries in the form of glosses, explanations, and commentary. Accordingly the "E document" is simply a group of additions to the basic narrative, having no continuous epic narration of its own. The same is true of P.[38]

Rudolph's section of the work offers an explanation of the variation in the divine names in the Joseph stories. He claims that the stories are contributed by one author who uses *Yahweh* when he himself is telling the story, but has his characters use *El-Shaddai* when they are speaking in Palestine and *Elohim* when in Egypt.[39]

Rudolph goes on to glance briefly at some other passages in Genesis which are commonly attributed to E, Gen. 20; 21:8-21, 22-32; 31:2, 4-16; 35:1-4, 7. He finds that there is indeed a certain unity of thought and intention in these narratives, in that they are all obviously aimed at defending the morally-dubious actions of a central character. Rudolph attributes these passages to "an interpolater who improved the J-tradition at certain points." He concludes,

---

[38] *Ibid*., pp. 21-25. [39] *Ibid*., pp. 148-151.

> Wenn man diesen Interpolator, der an einzelnen Punkten die J-Tradition verbessert, wegen seines eigentümlichen Sprachgebrauchs auch weiterhin den Elohisten heissen will, kann man das tun; aber angesichts der paar Stellen, die ihm zugehören, dürfte deutlich geworden sein, dass von einer Quelle im Sinn des seitherigen E, von einem dem J analogen Erzähler nicht die Rede sein kann.[40]

The careful work of Volz and Rudolph, later extended by Rudolph to cover the entire Hexateuch, offers an opportunity for scholars to review the whole literary-critical method which lies behind the commonly-accepted Wellhausenist solution of Pentateuchal origins. For this opportunity, and for the careful work which was carried out by Volz and Rudolph, scholars have reason to be grateful. Nevertheless, the writer believes that Volz and Rudolph have not dealt fairly with all of the evidence.

(1) We repeat, first of all, that the variation between Yahweh and Elohim cannot be viewed simply as an example of the rich and varied style of a single author, since the names are accompanied ~~by certain~~ other constants, both theological and linguistic.

---

[40] Ibid., p. 179.

(2) It is true that there are actually only a few extensive Elohistic narratives which parallel Yahwistic narratives, and that these are all in Genesis. But if even a small number of important constants can be established on the basis of these parallel narratives, then we have a basis for detecting Elohistic passages which lack J parallels.[41]

(3) It is true, as Volz and Rudolph claim, and as we have already said, that there was considerable academic myopia involved in the development of the neat Wellhausenist scheme. But if narratives can be detected throughout the Pentateuch which generally use Elohim and which display a consistent theological emphasis, what is to prevent us from postulating an E epic tradition, imperfectly preserved, which parallels the J epic? A realization of the weaknesses and fallacies built into the literary-critical solution should not blind us to the data which the theory attempted to explain. (More detailed criticism of Volz and Rudolph will be made from time to time in the following chapter, when we will discuss actual passages attributed to E.)

To sum up our findings thus far, we do not believe that either Pedersen and Engnell or Mowinckel, Volz, and Rudolph, working from their disparate points of view, have succeeded in doing away completely with E, although they have forced considerable qualifications into the older view and have prevented any simple acceptance of the literary-critical solutions of 19th-century scholars. A school or circle of E-traditionists at work in the early years of the Northern Kingdom, and having their own separate version of the pre-monarchical epic tradition, remains a possible explanation for the evidence. The full statement of this view, however, must await a presentation of the work of Gerhard von Rad and Martin Noth.

---

[41] See below, pp. 94ff.

(D) The Structure and Origin of the Hexateuch

The publication in 1938 of Gerhard von Rad's *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* signalled a new departure in Pentateuchal studies.[42] While accepting in large measure the Wellhausenist scheme concerning the sources and their dates, von Rad concerned himself with a more fundamental problem: how did the epic which lies behind the present Pentateuch come to be formulated, and what was its original structure?

---

[42] *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, 4. Folge, Heft 26 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938). Printed also in G. von Rad, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), pp. 9-86.

Von Rad found his answer in the outline of certain passages which appear to be liturgical summations of the faith of early Israel, capsule statements of the Heilsgeschichte: Dt. 26:5b-9; Dt. 6:20-24; Josh. 24:2-13. Von Rad calls the last passage "The Hexateuch in miniature."[43] These passages or similar "credos" must have been recited in the tribal-league cultus as confessions of faith, and were later used as the framework for the Hexateuchal narrative of Israel's origins. Thus the Hexateuch represents a baroque elaboration, on a gigantic scale, of Israel's primitive confession of faith.[44]

Comparison of these credal outlines with the Hexateuch itself, however, shows that the credos omit something of tremendous significance for Israel. They speak of the Promise to the Patriarchs, the Exodus from Egypt, and the Conquest of the land promised to the fathers, but say nothing of the Sinai covenant. The explanation for this, says von Rad, is that the Sinai tradition was maintained original structure?

---

[43] Gesammelte Studien zum A.T., p. 16.

[44] Ibid., pp. 58-81; Cf. also von Rad's Genesis (ET), pp. 13-42.

Von Rad found his answer in the outline of certain passages which appear to be liturgical summations of the faith of early Israel, capsule statements of the _Heilsgeschichte_: Dt. 26:5b-9; Dt. 6:20-24; Josh. 24:2-13. Von Rad calls the last passage "The Hexateuch in miniature."[43] These passages or similar "credos" must have been recited in the tribal-league cultus as confessions of faith, and were later used as the framework for the Hexateuchal narrative of Israel's origins. Thus the Hexateuch represents a baroque elaboration, on a gigantic scale, of Israel's primitive confession of faith.[44]

Comparison of these credal outlines with the Hexateuch itself, however, shows that the credos omit something of tremendous significance for Israel. They speak of the Promise to the Patriarchs, the Exodus from Egypt, and the Conquest of the land promised to the fathers, but say nothing of the Sinai covenant. The explanation for this, says von Rad, is that the Sinai tradition was maintained quite separately from the Patriarchs-Exodus-Conquest tradition, and brought into literary connection with this threefold historical tradition after the breakdown of the amphictyony. In short, the Hexateuch owes its present form to the Yahwist, who himself enfleshed the bare bones of the credo with scores of ancient traditions, and brought together the two great tradition-complexes of early Israel into an epic whole.[45]

---

[43] _Gesammelte Studien zum A.T._, p. 16.

[44] _Ibid._, pp. 58-81; Cf. also von Rad's _Genesis_ (ET), pp. 13-42.

Von Rad's contribution through this study has been felt in all quarters. His analysis of the significance of the "cultic credos" has thrown new light on these passages and on the whole Hexateuch, and his concern with the origins of the Hexateuchal tradition as a whole has given new life to studies in this area. The main weaknesses of his theory--and this critique is by no means original[46]--are in two areas:

(1) An analysis which severs the Exodus-Conquest tradition from the Sinai tradition, only to bring them

---

[45] "Das formgeschichtliche Problem..," Gesammelte Studien, pp. 20-33, 60-62.

[46] Cf. G. E. Wright, "Cult and History; a Current Problem in Old Testament Interpretation," Interpretation XVI (1962), pp. 3-20.

together in a purely literary manner at the finish, separates through analytical scholarship something that for early Israel was inseparable. The recital of Yahweh's saving intervention for his people, his past graciousness to his "vassal" Israel, was precisely what must have formed the prelude to the covenant ceremony itself. This is demonstrated with inescapable force by the studies of Mendenhall and Baltzer on ancient covenant forms.[47] The covenant ceremony must have been the occasion for the recital of the Heilsgeschichte; the covenant itself is naturally omitted in the recital of past history, for it is recalled and renewed following the recital in the actual ceremony, as in Josh. 24.

(2) The second point is closely connected with the first, for it involves the question of the contribution of the Yahwist. Von Rad, like many before him, has reconstructed the development of the Hexateuch along lines which are too purely literary. It is incredible that a single

---

[47] G. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and in the Ancient Near East (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955); K. Baltzer, Das Bundesformular (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960). Cf. also W. Beyerlin, Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1961), who comes to the same conclusion, though he begins his work with the older type of literary-critical verse separations.

author, writing in Solomon's time, should have drawn together the allegedly separate traditions of Exodus-Conquest and Sinai Covenant, severing them and many other narratives from their original cultic contexts, in addition to creating the Primeval History (Gen. 1-11) out of the similarly scattered and heterogeneous fragments of past tradition, forming the whole into an epic history stretching from Creation to the Conquest of Canaan.[48] To theorize such a literary composition is to ignore the function of oral literature in the whole life of the people. At the same time, von Rad fails to see the natural way in which the epic narrative could have been rooted in the historical recital which had its cultic _Sitz_ _im_ _Leben_ in the covenant ceremonies.

When we turn to the work of Martin Noth in this area, the last objection is overcome. In Noth's view the relation of J and E can only be explained if both are seen as the heirs of an older common tradition, which Noth designates "G" (_Grundlage_). This ancient pre-monarchical epic tradition already contained narratives grouped around five "themes": The deliverance from Egypt, the leading into the Promised Land, the promise to the Patriarchs, the leading in the

---

[48] Cf. Noth's criticism of von Rad in ÜP, pp. 42-44.

Wilderness, and the revelation (Offenbarung) on Sinai. Like von Rad, Noth holds that these traditions or themes were originally separate, reflecting memories of historical events which occurred in the life of separate groups. They were drawn together, put into a chronological sequence, and given an "all-Israel" orientation during the tribal-league period. This basic tradition thus lay ready to be used independently by both Yahwist and Elohist, writing in a later period.[49]

As suggested above, we believe that Noth is moving in the right direction when he theorizes the dependence of J and E upon a previous "G," thus minimizing the purely literary activity of both, and emphasizing instead the origin of the epic traditions in the life and worship of the people in the pre-monarchical period. But when we attempt to describe more precisely how this epic would have arisen, we run into considerable difficulty, for there is much that we do not know. Certainly Noth's theory of separate traditions at separate sanctuaries is no help in understanding how the traditions came to be drawn together. We now have good reason for believing that the sacred history was recited as a prologue to the covenant ceremony, yet there is much in the

---

[49] UP, pp. 40-44.

Pentateuch which would have no place in such a recital, such as the picaresque Jacob-Laban cycle which incorporates but is not dominated by old sanctuary legends.

Perhaps the explanation is that there existed in the early tribal-league period a poetic epic, incorporating ancient popular traditions, in addition to a number of sanctuary traditions. Salient points from this common body of traditions were drawn into the covenant ceremonies and summed up in the prologue to the covenant, and thus given a specifically all-Israel and sacred-historical cast. These prologues were in turn summarized into the very short credos mentioned by von Rad. The prologue and credal summaries, which would be periodically recited to "all-Israel" in cultic contexts, would then be in a position to exert formative influence back upon the folk-epic tradition, which gradually would come to assume a more or less fixed sacred-historical framework and theological orientation. This at any rate is a plausible reconstruction.

It is significant that Noth, like von Rad, retains much of the Wellhausenist scheme in his identification of the J and E sources, using literary-critical methods to accomplish minute separations in the text.[50] In regard to the dating of the sources, however, Noth follows his own course:

---

[50] Cf. ÜP, pp. 7-44.

> The question whether J or E is the earlier is disputed; E is usually taken to be the less ancient, but this cannot be proved for certain. In any case E in fact stands much nearer to the pre-literary stage of the Pentateuchal tradition than J, at whatever date the work may have been set down in writing.[51]

Whichever source is earlier, Noth holds, there is no doubt that J has been taken as the basis of the "Tetrateuch," with E worked in secondarily to supplement the J narrative. Thus he would agree with the contention of Volz and Rudolph that E as it now stands has no independence from J, although he maintains, as we do, that E once formed a separate and independent tradition.[52]

Conclusion

We have moved quickly over our review of modern criticism, omitting discussion of some interesting side-developments in order to proceed more rapidly into our analysis of the content, scope, and characteristics of E. After that we can state our own theory concerning the date and provenance of this tradition.

---

[51] M. Noth, Exodus, trans. by J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p. 15.

[52] UP, pp. 40-44.

The past half-century of criticism has held up to question the presuppositions and findings of earlier literary critics with regard to the Pentateuch and its sources. The Wellhausenist solution has withstood the attack, at least to the extent that we must still reckon with various identifiable collections of tradition which went into the final fabric of the Pentateuch.

Many of the linguistic criteria cited by earlier authors are not sufficient basis for carrying out minute source division--to this extent Engnell, Volz, Rudolph, and others, are correct--but there still remain some constant features, theological and linguistic, which enable us to designate some passages "J" and others "E."

The theory of individual authorship must give way, as Gunkel saw, to the more reasonable theory of a group or tradition-circle. As Noth emphasizes, no single author created the outline of either J or E; both have their roots in an amphictyonic epic tradition.

Finally, as Noth convincingly shows, the Tetrateuch must be separated from the Deuteronomic History, and treated in itself. This means that we cannot speak of the continuation of J and E into the Conquest narratives of Joshua, but must deal separately with the history of the traditions employed by the Deuteronomic historian in his work.[53]

---

[53] See below, pp. 186-94.

CHAPTER III

THE CONTENT AND SCOPE OF E

In our discussion of past and current scholarly evaluations of the Elohist tradition, we distinguished two broad stages in the development of criticism: (1) The identification of the E tradition by the methods of literary criticism; and (2) The questioning and defense of this identification in the light of form- and tradition-criticism, or simply on the basis of different literary-critical methodology. We felt that the attackers of the older critical methods and findings were justified at least to the extent that they pointed up fallacies in the presuppositions and methodology of the literary critics.

In the following pages we shall attempt to show that there is significant evidence for the existence of E as a unified and extensive epic tradition, parallel to the J tradition. In our analysis we shall not identify a given passage as E except where the evidence seems quite clear. We feel that many discussions have been vitiated by the assumption that wherever there are two non-Priestly traditions, one must be J and the other E. We shall not make this assumption, for there are many passages which must be of undeterminable origin. In accordance with the conclusion of the preceding chapter, we shall not assume that the E traditions are the product of a single author, thus displaying an unvaried style and vocabulary. We shall assume instead that these traditions are the product of a school or circle, possibly extending over a considerable period of time.

Because it is in the patriarchal narratives of Genesis that the evidence is most clear, we begin with the analysis of these traditions. Then we shall discuss the traditions of the Mosaic period. Lastly, we shall consider the question whether E can be clearly detected in the preceding and following sections of the Hexateuch; i.e., in the Primeval History (Gen. 1-11), and in the account of the Conquest (Josh. 1-11).

(A) The Patriarchal Narratives, Gen. 12-50

Since the work of Astruc in 1753 the variation in the use of the divine names has been the first criterion for the separation of sources in Genesis. Similarly, our analysis will begin with an examination of passages in which

Elohim is used as the divine name. A list of these passages follows:[1]

> Gen. 17:3, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23; 19:29; 20:3, 6, 11, 13, 17; 21:2, 4, 6, 12, 17, 19, 20, 22; 22:1, 3, 8, 9, 12; 27:28; 28:4, 12, 17, 20; 30:2, 6, 8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23; 31:7, 9, 11, 16, 24, 50; 32:2, 3, 29, 31; 33:5, 10, 11; 35:1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15; 39:9; 40:8; 41:16, 25, 28, 32, 38, 39, 51, 52; 42:18, 28, 29; 44:16; 45:5, 7, 8, 9; 46:2; 48:9, 11, 15, 21; 50:19, 20, 24, 25.

The use of *Elohim* is not in itself sufficient basis for postulating a continuous Elohistic source; this usage must be accompanied by the existence of other "constants" which characterize the style and interests of the Elohistic narratives.[2] Such constant features, however, can only be clearly determined comparatively; i.e., in passages where we are able to compare an Elohistic narrative with a Yahwistic account. Furthermore, such narratives must be of sufficient length that we may be certain that we are dealing with a separate and unified tradition.

---

[1] This excludes passages in which *Elohim* is used as a common noun, as it is frequently in construct in the phrase יהוה אלהי... (+ a noun or proper name); e.g., Gen. 24:3, 7, 12, 27, 42, 48.

[2] The notion of constants was put forward by Humbert in his review of Rudolph's *Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua*, TLZ 1938, cols. 404ff. Cf. also Bentzen's use of the term to designate "phenomena of different kinds occurring again and again, grouping themselves in such a manner as to combine the different traditions to form the collections which literary criticism calls "sources" or "documents," and which--if we accept the modern theories of oral traditions--serve as indicators which must group the oral traditions in a way leading to much the same results as literary criticism has led us to, even if we cannot establish an unbroken line of narratives, so as to extract whole separate "books" from the bulk of the Pentateuch." (*Introduction*, Vol. II, p. 26.)

An examination of the above-listed passages, after the elimination of texts which are unanimously assigned to P,[3] results in only three extensive Elohistic narratives which have clear parallels in Yahwistic accounts: Gen. 20:1-17 (parallel to 12:10-20; cf. Gen. 26:6-11); 21:8-20 (parallel to 16:1-14); 21:22-34 (parallel to 26:17-33). The rest of the non-Priestly occurrences of Elohim are in passages which do not have clear Yahwistic parallels, or in passages where Yahwistic and Elohistic features are intertwined.

In our discussion of these three passages we shall attempt to establish significant characteristics of the Elohistic narratives which distinguish them from their Yahwistic parallels. Once we have determined a few constant features of the Elohistic traditions, we shall be in a better position to discuss the Elohistic passages which lack J parallels, and passages where the two traditions are mingled.

---

[3] Gen. 17; 19:29; 21:2, 4; 35:9-13, 15; 46:2; so Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, The Hexateuch, Vol. I, pp. 273-75. Essentially the same contents of P are established by Noth in ÜP, pp. 7-19. Cf. also S. R. Driver, Introduction, pp. 11-12; R. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 188-89.

(1) Texts Having Yahwistic Parallels

(a) Gen. 20:1-17.---The outstanding peculiarities of the Elohistic version of this tradition, when compared with the J (Gen. 12:10-20), are: (1) The theme of divine revelation or communication, taking place in a dream (חלום, vv. 3,6); (2) The statement that Abraham was a prophet (נביא, v. 7); (3) Abraham's intercession (יתפלל, vv. 7, 17); (4) The emphasis on questions of moral integrity (תם לבב, vv. 5, 6), innocence (נקין כפי, v. 4), righteousness (cf. צריק, v. 4), sin (חטא, vv. 6, 9) and "fear of God"(יראת אלהים, v. 11).

Every one of these features importantly distinguishes the Elohistic tradition from its J parallel. Here the narrative speaks in the moral and religious categories of sin, guilt, justice, innocence, and the fear of God; while in Gen. 12:10-20 the story-teller emphasizes the beauty of Sarah, and the danger to the fulfilment of the divine promise received by Abraham.[4] Here Abraham is expressly designated a prophet (נביא); his prophetic office is defined as that of intercession, and it is only by his intercession that the pagan king can be freed from his guilt.[5]

---

[4] Cf. G. von Rad, Genesis, trans. John Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 162-65, 225. The J narrative of Gen. 26:7-11, which shows the use of the same narrative motif in the Isaac cycle, may be the most ancient version of the tale; so Noth, ÜP, pp. 114-18, 170-71, 208-209. In any case it also lacks the theological depth and detail of the E narrative in Gen. 20, and is even more concise than the parallel J story in 12:10-20.

These elements in the Elohistic narrative, all of which are quite lacking in the J parallel, do indeed introduce a "completely new theological concern" into the Patriarchal narratives.[6] Moreover, these concerns richly delineate the circle in which the tradition received such a peculiar stamp. They point to an environment in which a specifically religious presentation of history is being worked out, a group which idealizes the prophet and is concerned with questions of revelation.

---

[5] The verb used for Abraham's intercession, יתפלל, is also used of the intercession of Moses (Num. 11:2; 21:7; Dt. 9:20, 26), Hannah (I Sam. 1:10, 27; 2:1), Samuel (I Sam. 7:5; 8:6; 12:19, 23), Elisha (II Kg. 4:33; 6:17, 18), Hezekiah (II Kg. 19:15, 20; 20:2, *passim* in Isa. 37-38); Jeremiah (Jer. 38:3; 42:2, 4, 20), Jonah (Jon. 2:2; 4:2), Job (Job 42:8, 10), Nehemiah (Neh. 1:4, 6; 2:4; 4:3), Solomon (II Chr. 6:20). The occurrences of the verb fall into two broad groups: those passages in which it means to pray for oneself, and texts in which it means to pray or intercede for another. The meaning "intercede" comes from the notion "to seek consideration"; so E. A. Speiser, "The Stem *PLL* in Hebrew," JBL LXXXII (Sept., 1963), p. 305. The intimate connection of intercession with the role of the prophet as suggested in the present passage is also found in other passages deriving from Northern traditions (Num. 12:13; Dt. 9:26; I Sam. 12:19-23; II Kg. 4:33; 6:17, 18; Jer. 37:3; 42:2, 4, 20), and must stem originally from an early stage in the prophetic movement in which the connection with the cultus was close; so G. von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 223; cf. H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902), explaining התפלל as "ursprünglich term. Techn. für die Fürbitte des Gottesmannes. . ." (p. 195).

[6] G. von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

That this chapter is the *locus classicus* of the E tradition has generally been assumed.[7] Even Paul Volz acknowledged it as the work of another hand than the Yahwist, though of course he does not consider the tradition to be independent of J or part of a continuous epic source.[8] At this stage in our presentation we can only note its peculiarities in theological emphasis, and watch for their reappearance in other Elohistic narratives. Similarly, we cannot yet say whether various stylistic features (in addition to *Elohim*) point to a characteristic vocabulary, distinct from that of J. Scholars have especially noted the use of אמה in contrast to J's שפחה.[9] This, however, remains dubious, since שפחה is used in v. 14.[10]

---

[7] "The narrative is unanimously ascribed to the Elohist, wherever one reckons with the existence of this document at all" (Von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 221). Speaking of Gen. 20:1-17 and 21:8-21, Volz asserts, "Diese beiden Stücke werden ganz allgemein E zugeschrieben; es steht dies wie bei 22:1-14 fast als ein Dogma fest" (*Der Elohist als Erzähler*, p. 34).

[8] *Op. cit.*, pp. 34-36.

[9] J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 315; H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 193.

(b) Gen. 21:8-21.---The second of our three Elohistic narratives, the story of the expulsion of Hagar, finds its Yahwistic parallel in Gen. 16:4-14; more precisely, Gen. 21:9-21 parallels 16:4b-14.

Significantly, the theme of divine revelation through a night dream (cf. v. 14 and 20:8), which was an important distinguishing mark of the Elohistic narrative of Gen. 20, is again prominent here. In the J account, Abraham simply acts in accordance with Sarah's wishes and allows her to expel the slave woman (16:6). In the present narrative, however, Abraham is disturbed at the demand of Sarah until he receives a revelation from God, in which he is instructed to expel the slave and is promised progeny through both Ishmael and Isaac (21:11-14). In the same direction, J's story of the direct encounter of Hagar with the angel (16:7f) is here matched by the voice of the "angel of God" calling to Hagar "from heaven" (v. 17). The use of this motif, like that of the divine speech in a night dream, points to a traditionist circle deeply concerned to emphasize a particular type of revelation, which in Israel was associated with prophecy.[11]

---

[10] Carpenter and Harford-Battersby suggest that the occurrence of שפחה here may be a copyist's error or the result of a redactor's activity (The Hexateuch, Vol. II, p. 29). Might we not instead question the assumption that E can always be identified by the use of אמה ? Cf. the vocabulary tables of the same authors, Vol. I, p. 190. See below, p. 101, n. 13.

Past commentators, who unanimously assign this passage to E,[12] have pointed to the use of *Elohim* (vv. 12, 17 thrice, 19, 20); and the use of אמה (vv. 10-12, 13), where J uses שפחה (16:1, 5, 8).[13] As before, we must remain cautious, but the existence of two Elohistic passages with at least one important theological motif in common--the theme of divine revelation--strengthens the supposition that we are dealing here with a considerable and independent body of tradition.

---

[11] The dream, חלום, is mentioned as a vehicle of revelation in a number of texts throughout the OT. Outside the Tetrateuch, the dream appears as a revelatory experience, but with no mention of prophecy, in Jg. 7:13, 15; I Kg. 3:5, 15; Job 33:15; Dan. 1:17; 2:1, 2, 3. The dream is expressly associated with prophecy in several passages in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah: Dt. 13:2 (EV 13:1), 4 (EV, 3), 6 (EV, 5); Jer. 23:27, 28, 32; 27:9; 29:8. *In I Sam.* 28:6, 15, dreams are associated with Urim and prophets; Joel 3:1 (EV 2:28) places prophecy, dreams, and visions (חזינות) in parallel. The dream in the OT and later literature has been studied by E. L. Ehrlich, *Der Traum im Alten Testament*, BZAW 73 (Berlin, 1953). For ancient Near Eastern literature generally, see A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. XLVI, Pt. 3 (Philadelphia, 1956).

[12] See the remark of Volz, quoted in n. 7 above. Cf. Skinner, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-21; Gunkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-202; Procksch, *Die Elohimquelle*, pp. 11-13. Noth (ÜP, p. 38) designates vv. 8-20, 21b as E.

[13] Skinner (*loc. cit.*) and Gunkel (*loc. cit.*) both mention the use of אמה in 21:10, 12, 13, as opposed to J's שפחה in 16:2, 3, 5, 8. Of the sixteen occurrences of אמה in the Pentateuch, all designated E by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 190), eight are in

(c) Gen. 21:22-34.--The third Elohistic narrative which has a parallel in J material, the story of the controversy and covenant with Abimelech, does not display any significant theological emphases of the E traditions, as did the traditions just discussed.

The presumed parallel to the present narrative is found in the Yahwistic Isaac stories of Gen. 26:12-33. The two narratives have the same themes: the covenant with Abimelech concerning water-rights, and the explanation of the name of Beer-Sheba (as "seven" in 21:29f.; as "oath" in 20:31; 26:32f.). But the narratives are both so close to ancient traditional material that it is impossible to detect any outstanding peculiarities in the way they are used by the Elohist and the Yahwist writers. It is only associated with other Elohistic passages because of the use of Elohim (vv. 22-23) and because of the apparent connection

---

the Covenant Code, which can scarcely be expected to display characteristic E vocabulary (see below, pp. 152ff.). Of the remaining eight, five occur in Gen. 21:1-17 and in the present chapter. Of the rest (Gen. 30:3; 31:33; Ex. 2:5) only one (Gen. 31:33) can with any certainty be ascribed to E--and on other grounds. We must conclude that the use of אמה is not in itself sufficient grounds for assigning a passage to E, although it might be of significance in conjunction with other features.

with the tradition of Gen. 21, where Abimelech is first introduced into the Patriarchal story.[14] Other linguistic peculiarities, such as those cited by Gunkel, are highly dubious.[15] The attempt to divide the story into J and E passages in detail is especially precarious.[16] In short, there is only slight basis for attributing the narrative to the circle which produced Gen. 20 and 21:8-21, and in any case the text reveals nothing important about the theological viewpoint of its author or authors.

(d) Conclusion.--Of the three narratives which we have discussed, only two appear to be of value in establishing the characteristics of the passages which use *Elohim*. But these are highly important texts which indicate that the primary interests of the narrators are the problems of

---

[14] Gunkel, *op*. *cit*., p. 205.

[15] Gunkel (*loc*. *cit*.) mentions "Worte wie das selten vorkommende נין ונכר 23 u.a." This certainly does not constitute proof that the passage is E! Cf. the criticisms of Volz, *op*. *cit*., pp. 39-40.

[16] The division into J and E is defended in Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op*. *cit*., Vol. II, pp. 30-31; similarly in Gunkel, *op*. *cit*., pp. 205-207; and Procksch, *op*. *cit*., p. 10. Some of the older commentators, however, viewed the tradition as entirely E; see J. Wellhausen, CH, p. 29; R. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), pp. 42-43. Von Rad (*Genesis*, p. 232) regards the passage as a unity, and attributes it to E. Volz (*op*. *cit*., p. 40) also regards it as a unity, but of course assigns it to J. In any case, the arguments for dividing the narrative between two documentary sources are not convincing.

revelation, and questions of sin, guilt, and the fear of God. In conjunction with these interests, we noted the designation of Abraham as a prophet--a term unique in the Genesis narratives--and suggested the probability that the traditions of Gen. 20 and 21:8-21 stemmed from prophetic groups.

Now we shall turn to extensive narratives which employ the name Elohim, and which display some of the same characteristics which we have noted above, but which do not have Yahwistic parallels.

(2) Texts Lacking Yahwistic Parallels

(a) Gen. 22:1-19--The similarities between this striking narrative and the traditions we have already discussed indicate an intimate connection between them. Again, Abraham receives a revelation through God"s speaking to him and again, it is implied, this revelation takes place at night (v. 3). As in 21:17 the angel calls from heaven (vv. 11, 15). As in 21:11 the "fear of God" is a vital concern for the narrator (v. 12).

The major critical difficulties in the story are: (a) The use of Yahweh in vv. 11-14, 15, while Elohim is otherwise used throughout (vv. 1, 3, 8, 9, 12); and (b) the question whether vv. 15-19, or part of that passage, are to be regarded as a later addition to the original narrative. Certainly these verses represent an abrupt change from the lapidary style of the preceding story, with its suspense and restrained pathos, and the transition ("And the angel of Yahweh called to Abraham a second time from heaven") is suspiciously awkward.

The most probable solution is that the Elohistic narrative is contained in vv. 1-14, 19, while vv. 15-18 represent a later addition in the style of the Yahwistic promises to the patriarchs (cf. Gen. 12:2; 15:5; 16:10; 32:13; 24:60). The passage betrays its late and secondary character not only by its patchwork appearance, resulting from the use of motifs from several of the promise formulas, but also by the phrase נאם יהוה in the mouth of an angel.[17]

The use of Yahweh instead of Elohim in v. 11 can be explained as a late harmonization of the original narrative with the secondary material in vv. 15-18, while the use of Yahweh in v. 14 is made necessary in the explanation of the name יהוה יראה.[18]

---

[17] Von Rad, op. cit., pp. 237-38. The phrase נאם יהוה, much used in later prophetic literature, is found elsewhere in the Hexateuch only in Num. 14:28 (P).

[18] Cf. Noth, ÜP, p. 38, n. 132: "ss:15-18 wird meist--mit Recht--als Zusatz ausgeschieden. In v. 14 wird man für den Ausnahmefall einer Namenerklärung das Vorkommen von יהוה auch in einem E-Text nicht beanstanden dürfen. Von da aus dürfte in v. 11 sekundar יהוה für ursprüngliches אלהים eingesetzt worden sein." The present writer's analysis, as can be seen is identical with Noth's, and has previously been suggested by a number of scholars. Cf. Wellhausen, CH, p. 20; Gunkel, op. cit., pp. 210-212; Skinner, op. cit., p. 331.

The substance of the story (22:1-14), however, may with good reason be attributed to the same circle which produced the narrative of Gen. 20 and 21:8-21. The major themes of this story--revelation, testing, obedience and the fear of God--are fully consonant with the characteristic theology of the latter narratives, and Elohim is consistently used except in v. 11, as explained above.

Past critics, who attribute this tradition to E almost unanimously,[19] point to certain vocabulary and stylistic peculiarities in addition to the use of Elohim. The most important of these are: (1) The formula used to introduce the story, ויהי אחר הדברים האלה (v. 1); (2) The formula by which the divine communication is described, ויאמר אליו אברהם ויאמר הנני (vv. 1, 11); (3) The use of נסה, "to test," with the Deity as subject.

Of these usages, the most important is doubtless the revelatory formula in vv. 1, 11, since this is closely connected with what we have seen to be a major theological concern in the other E traditions discussed. None of the above features, however, may be regarded as valid marks of an "E style" unless they consistently appear in conjunction with other weighty criteria. An examination of the passages in which these phrases occur, as listed in the tables of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby,[20] shows that these expressions rarely occur in such undoubted E contexts.

---

[19] So Procksch, op. cit., pp. 12-13; Wellhausen, op. cit., pp. 20-22; Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse (Leipzig: J. G. Heinrich, 1922), pp. 33-34; Noth, UP, p. 38, n. 132; cf. Volz, as quoted above, n. 7.

(1) ויהי אחר הדברים האלה occurs verbatim in Gen. 39:7 and in 40:1; it appears without the ויהי in Gen. 15:1 and with the plural אחרי in Gen. 48:1. Disregarding these variations, the expression occurs in only two passages which can for other strong reasons be labeled "E": the present passage (22:1), and Gen. 40:1. Of the remaining two, one (Gen. 39:7) appears in a passage otherwise generally attributed to J;[21] and the other (Gen. 15:1) in a notoriously difficult passage where E is closely fused with J, if there is an E tradition present at all.[22] The expression also occurs three times in the Deuteronomic History (I Kg. 13:33; 17:12; 21:1).

(2) The formula, ויאמר אלהים אברהם ויאמר הנני , or some variation of it, occurs in the context of a divine revelation elsewhere in Gen. 31:11; 46:2; Ex. 3:4b. In all of these passages other important marks of the E tradition

---

[20] *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 190-92.

[21] Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 274) attribute all of Gen. 39 to J except for vv. 4b, 6ac, 7a, which are designated "E." Noth (ÜP, p. 31) assigns the entire chapter to J, as does von Rad (*op. cit.*, p. 359).

[22] See below, pp. 122ff.

are present.[23] The vocabulary tables of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby also list the same or a similar expression in the context of human discourse in Gen. 22:7; 37:1, 13b, 18; Num. 14:40. These passages are irrelevant for the identification of E, since we must concern ourselves with expressions having a clearly characteristic theological context. The expression is also used more than once in the story of the call of Samuel, I Sam. 3:4, 6, 8, 10, which we consider to be from a tradition related to E.[24]

(3) The verb נסה , with God as the subject, occurs also in Ex. 15:25; 16:4; 20:20; Dt. 33:8, all designated "E" by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. Only one of these (Ex. 20:20) occurs in a passage which can on other grounds be assigned to E.[25]

Our conclusion must be that the linguistic peculiarities of E which are cited in connection with Gen. 22 are of rather small value in themselves. Far more important is the deeper understanding of the characteristic theological emphasis of E which can be gained from this tradition. The patriarch Abraham, formerly described as a prophet and intercessor (Gen. 20:7, 17), whose actions are above blame (20:12), is now tested, that God may know whether he is obedient--more precisely, whether he is one who "fears God" (v. 12). The tradition therefore extends our understanding of the יראת אלהים which is first mentioned in 20:11: it consists not merely of "religion," but of absolute obedience to the word of God. This motif of obedience, together with the theme of divine revelation, again suggests a real basis for the attribution of E to a prophetic circle. The famous pronouncement of Samuel is to the point:

---

[23] See the discussion of the individual passages below, pp. 128f., 119f., 136-40.

[24] See below, pp. 220ff.

[25] See below, pp. 155-61.

> Has Yahweh as great delight in burnt offerings
>   and sacrifices,
> As in obeying Yahweh's voice?
> Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,
> And to hearken than the fat of rams! (I Sam. 15:22)

In concluding our discussion of Gen. 22, let us note the great importance of the identification of this passage as E. If this entirely independent tradition can be assigned to the same body of traditions which is visible in Gen. 20:1-17 and Gen. 21:8-21, then E can be thought of as a continuing narrative strand not dependent upon J. In short, the identification of Gen. 22:1-14 as E undercuts the whole argument of Volz and Rudolph that E never existed as a body of traditions independent of J. Volz recognized this when he wrote,

> Unsere Untersuchung steht hier vor einer überaus wichtigen Frage, denn wenn dieses Kapitel von E stammen würde und nur in ihm (oder auch nur in der Hauptsache von ihm) überliefert wäre, so wäre damit erwiesen, dass E ein selb-

ständiger, eigenes Gut enthaltender Erzähler gewesen wäre.[26] It is our opinion that several features of the narrative of 22:1-14, 19, tie this tradition very closely with the traditions of 20:1-17 and 21:8-31, most notably the use of *Elohim*, the theme of the fear of God, and the pattern of nocturnal revelation. These are among the classical marks of E, so that the designation of all three passages as E can scarcely be avoided.

(3) The Joseph Narratives, Gen. 37; 39-50

Among the patriarchal narratives the Joseph stories are remarkable both for their length and for their literary unity. This unity makes them resistant to the customary applications of source criticism. Furthermore, the clues elsewhere supplied by the divine names are almost entirely lacking: *Yahweh* is used only in Ch. 39. These considerations suggest that the Joseph stories have had their own peculiar history of transmission.

Nevertheless, from Wellhausen on the regnant source criticism has been applied to these stories, and considerable agreement has been reached as to the portions to be assigned to J, E, and P. Such diverse authors as Carpenter and Harford-Battersby,[27] von Rad,[28] Pfeiffer,[29] and Noth[30] present similar analyses, differing mainly in details.

---

[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 43 (his italics).

[27] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 274.

[28] *Op. cit.*, pp. 342-434.

[29] *Op. cit.*, pp. 144, 169f.

[30] *UP*, pp. 17-40.

Although he followed methods of source-criticism in his Genesis commentary, Gunkel described the total composition of the Joseph tales as a Novelle, and pointed to the impossibility of separating individual portions from the narrative as a whole, which has a profound organic unity.[31] In a later writing, Gunkel dispensed with source criticism, and assumed that both the J and E versions of the Joseph story had essentially the same content and style of presentation. Aware of the danger of breaking up the inner unity of the Novelle through a mechanically-applied source analysis, Gunkel commented:

> Das Gegeben würde sein, dass wir unser Arbeit auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Quellenkritik vornähmen. Nun ist aber diese durch Smend aufs neue ins Schwanken geraten. Trotzdem ist das für uns kein unüberwindliches Hindernis. Denn gerade in der Joseph--wie übrigens auch in der Jacob-Erzählung--stimmen die Quellen, die man gefunden oder zu finden geglaubt hat, in den Grundzügen der Komposition überein. Umgekehrt aber wird eine zukünftige Quellenscheidung an diesen Untersuchungen der Komposition unmöglich vorübergehen dürfen, wenn sie sich nicht in die Gefahr begeben will, innerlich Zusammengehöriges auseinanderzureissen.[32]

---

[31] Op. cit., pp. 349-51.

[32] "Die Komposition der Joseph-Geschichte," ZDMG 1922, pp. 55ff. The same type of analysis and the same view of the results of source-criticism are evident in Gressmann's "Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Sage," Eucharisterion, ed. Hans Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 1-55. Eissfeldt's rejoinder to the Gunkel article, reasserting the necessity for careful source criticism, appears in the same volume, pp. 56-77.

Wilhelm Rudolph, in his study of the Joseph story, enthusiastically applauds Gunkel's suggestions about the limitations of source criticism, and proceeds to an analysis which is intended to demonstrate the almost perfect unity of the narrative. He discards the material and linguistic variations which first suggested that the stories were composite, or else attempts to explain these inconsistencies on artistic or esthetic grounds. The variation between the divine names Yahweh, Elohim, and El-shadday is represented by Rudolph as the deliberate stylistic variation of one author: Yahweh is used when the narrator himself speaks; Elohim is used in the speeches of the characters in the story when they are in Egypt; El-Shadday occurs only in the speeches of the characters when they are in Palestine.[33] The alternate application of the names "Jacob" and "Israel" to the patriarch does not point to J and E usages; the single author may simply interchange these names promiscuously.[34] Material contradictions, doublets and repetitions in the narrative are either disproved or otherwise explained.[35]

As will appear in the following discussion, Rudolph's treatment is highly artificial and ignores the conjunction of material contradictions and linguistic peculiarities which point to the combination of very similar J and E versions of the story, with P editing. This does not mean that the extremely detailed analysis of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby or of Martin Noth can be upheld; it does mean that we cannot altogether dispense with source criticism in our consideration of these narratives.

---

[33] Der Elohist als Erzähler, pp. 148-49.

[34] Ibid., pp. 149-50.

[35] Ibid., pp. 151-75.

(a) Gen. 37, 39.--In the first chapter of the Joseph narratives we encounter a *locus classicus* for the distinguishing of two contradictory narrative strands. In 37:21ff. first Reuben and then Judah appear as spokesmen for the eleven brothers. A little further on we meet confusion over the fate of Joseph: was he stolen from the pit by the Midianites, or sold by his brothers to the Ishmaelites? (37:28f., 26; 39:1)

It is assumed by most critics that two narratives are here reflected. In one, Reuben pleads for the life of Joseph and has him placed in a pit or dry cistern(vv. 21-24), whence he is stolen by the Midianite traders who happen by on their journey towards Egypt (vv. 28a, 39, 36). In the other narrative, Judah is the leader of the two brothers and Joseph is sold by them to Ishmaelite traders (vv. 25-27, 28b; 39:1).[36] This explanation of the peculiarities of the story is far more convincing than the strained reconstruction of Rudolph, who must assume that the Midianites take Joseph from the pit while the brothers negotiate with the Ishmaelites, and that Reuben does not know of the sale when he returns to the pit to look for Joseph.[37]

---

[36] See, for example, the summary of J. Skinner, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-50.

> The narrative is, in the relation of Volz and Rudolph, exceedingly clumsy--which contrasts very peculiarly against their constant emphasis on the idea of the artistic cleverness of the Yahwist. It is--in spite of all antagonists of the documentary hypothesis--more "natural" to assume two interwoven tales, of which one (v. 28) does not know the proposal of Judah in vv. 26f., but presupposes the strategem of Reuben from v. 20, countered by the theft of vv. 28-29. That the "recensions" cannot be separated completely throughout the entire chapter, is--as everywhere--no argument against these traces of two narratives, which must have been--in other parts--so highly alike to one another that combination cannot be verified in other parts. To all this must be added that Rudolph only by means of much sophism can evade the fact that the two "motives," the sale and the theft, are mentioned separated from one another later in the narrative, cf. 45:4f. and 40:15.[38]

Since the divine names are not used anywhere in Ch. 38, we have no clue in that chapter alone as to the sources of the two narrative strands. But the continuation of the Judah-Ishmaelite strand in Ch. 39, together with the frequent use of Yahweh in that chapter, indicate that we should associate this strand with the Yahwist epic. If, therefore, 37:25-27, 28b; 39:1-23 are J, we may tentatively identify

---

[37] Op. cit., pp. 152-55.

[38] A. Bentzen, Introduction, Vol. II, p. 46.

37:21-24, 28a, 29-30, 36, with E.[39]

(b) Gen. 40-41.--The above identification is supported by signs of the Elohist tradition in Gen. 40-41. Elohim appears throughout these chapters (ten times: 40:8; 41:16, 25, 28, 32, 38, 39, 51, 52); Yahweh is not used. An explicit reference to Joseph's being stolen from the pit (40:15) connects this section with the Reuben-Midianites strand in Ch. 37.[40] Moreover, there is no difficulty in connecting the religious outlook of these chapters with what we have seen of E's theological emphases. Much interest is shown in the revelation of God's purpose through dreams; technical terms of dream interpretation are used in an easy and natural way, and the whole episode falls into the classic pattern of ancient dream reports.[41] Yet dream interpretation is taken out of the sphere of divination and put into the hands of Joseph, a man "in whom is the spirit of God" (41:38; cf. 40:8). Thus in this narrative, as in Gen. 20, we encounter the work of those early prophetic schools in Israel in which ancient divinatory practices were brought into the realm of Yahweh's sovereignty--circles in which precisely this question was being asked, and answered affirmatively: "Do not interpretations belong to God?" (40:8)

---

[39] This is the conclusion of most critics; cf. Wellhausen, CH, pp. 54f.; Skinner, *op. cit.*, p. 443; Gunkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 354ff.; von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 348. Gunkel attempted a further division of the sources in 37:1-20 through an analysis of the dominant narrative motifs. One strand (vv. 5-11, 19-20, 28a, 29-30) is dominated by the themes of the dream, the cistern, and the Midianites who steal Joseph; while the other (vv. 3-4, 23, 25-27, 28b, 32f.) is dominated by the themes of the coat and the sale to the Ishmaelites. In addition, the dream-Midianites-Reuben strand uses "Israel." In Gunkel's analysis, the former strand (vv. 5-11, 19-20, 28a, 29-30) is E; the latter is J (*op. cit.*, p. 356). There is, however, some doubt as to the possibility of such detailed analysis; cf. the remarks of Bentzen, quoted above, p. 114.

[40] Chs. 40-41 have long been regarded as basically Elohistic; cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 57; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 274; von Rad, *op. cit.*, pp. 365, 372-75. Traces of J have been found in Ch. 41, especially in vv. 34a, 35b, 40-45a, 46b, 49, 55; so Noth, ÜP, p. 31. The contradictions and repetitions which led to these divisions include: the two different terms for Joseph's master ("the Egyptian," 39:2, 5; "Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, the captain of the guard," 39:1; cf. 41:50); the recommendation by Joseph for the appointment of a single official over all Egypt (41:33), as compared to the appointment of a group of overseers in 41:34; the state's taking one-fifth of the harvest (41:34) as compared to the exacting of the entire harvest (41:35); the twice-repeated report of Joseph's appointment (41:40, 41, 42f.); of his trip of inspection (vv. 46b, 47), and of the coming of the famine (vv. 54, 55). Cf. von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 372; Skinner, *op. cit.*, pp. 464f.

We conclude that Chs. 40-41 are largely E, while Ch. 39 is J. With the E traditions of Chs. 40-41 we identify the traditions reflected in 37:21-24, 28a, 29-30, 36. Further certainty is impossible in spite of the various traces of a double tradition concerning Joseph's beginnings in Egypt.[42]

---

[41] E.g., the use of פתר and derivatives (cf. Akkadian pašāru) in 40:5, 8, 12, 18, 22; 41:8, 11, 12, 13, 15. The report that the recipients of the dreams were "troubled" (40:6; 41:8) and the description of the awakening in 41:7 (cf. I Kg. 3:15) follow standard dream-report patterns. See E. L. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-84; A. L. Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-245.

(c) Gen. 43.--In Ch. 43 the position of Judah as spokesman (vv. 3, 8-10) suggests J. The use of Elohim by the Egyptianized Joseph might be stylistic (43:29), since a foreigner would not be expected to use Yahweh. Simeon's incarceration in Egypt, reported in the E narrative of 42:19-24, 33, 36, does not serve as the motive for the brothers' return, and the report of the brothers' first encounter with Joseph is given differently than in the E tradition of Ch. 42 (cf. 42:29-37; 43:3-7).[43] "Israel" is used consistently in Ch. 43, while in Ch. 42 the patriarch is called "Jacob." Thus, Ch. 43 can be quite clearly distinguished from Ch. 42, and may be linked to J by the use of "Israel," and especially by the position of Judah.[44]

(d) Gen. 44.--In Ch. 44 Judah again acts as the spokesman (cf. 44:13, 16, 18-34, with 42:37), and again the captivity of Simeon is forgotten in the recital of Joseph's past dealings with his brothers (44:18-34). The chapter is thus a continuation of the J tradition of Ch. 43; nothing positively points to the inclusion of any E materials.[45]

---

[42] See above, n. 40. Skinner (op. cit., p. 465) remarks that "some of these differences may, no doubt, prove to be illusory; but taken cumulatively they suffice to prove that the passage is composite, although a satisfactory analysis cannot be given."

[43] Only in v. 14 is Simeon mentioned. The use there of אל שדי suggests a harmonizing redaction, since neither J nor E ever use this term elsewhere.

[44] Cf. n. 39, above.

(e) Gen. 45.--Ch. 45 presents a less homogeneous appearance than the preceding chapters; most critics have found traces of both major sources here. The most serious difficulty is in the contrasting accounts of the invitation to Jacob. In vv. 9-15, Joseph invites Jacob and his family to immigrate to Goshen immediately; in vv. 16-20 the Pharaoh himself issues a gracious invitation for Jacob to come and settle any place in Egypt. The former tradition is continued in 46:13-47:5, which assumes that the Pharaoh must later be informed of Jacob's arrival and grant permission for him to stay. Verses 9-15 are closely connected with vv. 5-8, while vv. 16-20 are continued in vv. 21-28.

The simplest solution is to regard vv. 5-15 as basically Elohistic, because of the use of Elohim (vv. 5, 7, 8, 9), and vv. 16-28 as basically Yahwistic because of the use of Israel. In addition, we might distinguish two traditions about Joseph's self-revelation to his brothers, vv. 2-3 and vv. 1, 4.[46] This division remains conjectural. We must agree with Skinner that "the sources . . . are here so intimately blended that a complete analysis is impossible."[47]

---

[45] The use of Elohim in Judah's speech is not ground enough for assigning the passage to E. Again we must reckon either with redaction or with stylistic variation on the part of the J school.

[46] This is basically the division of Noth (ÜP, pp. 31, 38), who regards vv. 1, 4, 5a, 16-28 as J; and vv. 2, 3, 5b-15 as E.

(f) Gen. 46-47.--Critics agree in designating the substance of 46:6-27 as P or as secondary.[48] Of the remainder of the chapter, vv. 1-4 contain a theophany tradition that is certainly Elohistic. In 46:1-4, God speaks to Jacob in a night vision (מראת הלילה) at Beer-Sheba (vv. 1-2). The form of address (יעקב יעקב) and the reply (הנני)follow closely the pattern pointed out in the E narratives of Gen. 21 and 22.[49] Theologically, this passage is significant in stressing that momentous events in the history of the people of God are accompanied by divine revelations. Jacob's descent into Egypt is prompted by this revelation and not by his desire to see his long absent son.[50] We take this as further evidence of the specifically prophetic view of the narrator.

In the very interesting section 47:13-28, relating the assumption of direct control of property by the Egyptian crown, no clear indication of source is present except in

---

[47] *Op. cit.*, p. 468.

[48] Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 274) call vv. 6, 8-27 "P." Gunkel (*op. cit.*, pp. 433-35) indicates that vv. 6a, 7 are P; vv. 8-27 are secondary. This analysis is essentially that of Rudolph (*op. cit.*, p. 165) and of Noth (ÜP, p. 18).

[49] See above, pp. 107ff.

[50] B. W. Anderson in *The Oxford Annotated Bible*, H.G. May and B. Metzger, eds. (*New York: Oxford, 1962*), *ad loc*.

vv. 27-31, where the work of the Priestly editor is evident.[51]

The very complex composition of Ch. 48 is suggested by the presence of P wording in 48:3, 4, 7,[52] and by the intrusion of the blessing in vv. 15-16. E material is suggested by the use of *Elohim* in vv. 9, 11, 15, 20, 21, but the blessings themselves are probably independent traditional material and are not likely to show anything specific about E's theology. Noth treats the chapter as basically E (vv. 1, 2, 7-14, 17-22), with secondary redaction indicated by the insertion of the blessing (vv. 15-16). He admits, however, that this does not solve the problems: "Der vorpriesterschriftliche Bestand von Gen. 48 ist sehr brüchig und kaum noch in seinem ursprünglichen Zustand."[53]

Passing over Ch. 49,[54] we encounter in Gen. 50 a passage which is quite probably E, and which is important for what it reveals of the E tradition's theological emphasis. Here, as in Gen. 20, the history of the chosen people is told in the explicit categories of obedience, sin, guilt, and forgiveness. By this means the E circle subdues the ancient and popular folk traditions of Israel to a theological scheme which has its origin in a prophetic interpretation of history.[55]

---

[51] E.g., the phrase ויפרו וירבו מאד (v. 27) and the connection of v. 30 with the P traditions of Gen. 23; 49:29-33; 50:13. Cf. Gunkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 436-37; Noth, ÜP, pp. 17-18.

[52] I.e., אל שרי (v. 3); מפרך והרביתך ; נתתי לקהל ;
עמים (v. 4); פדן (v. 7); see Skinner, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

[53] ÜP, p. 38, n. 136.

[54] Noth rightly comments, "Der 'Jakobsegen' ist von Elementen der P-Erzählung umrahmt; seine übliche zuweisung an J ist literarisch ebensowenig zu begründen wie die des Mosesegens an E. Er ist für uns ein Sonderstück, von dem wir schlechterdings nicht wissen, in welchem Stadium der Werdeprozesses des Pentateuch es in den jetzigen Zusammenhang Aufnahme fand;" ÜP, p. 18, n. 54.

(4) Texts in Which J and E Are Mingled

To this point we have been discussing two types of E material in Genesis: (a) those few extensive passages which have clear parallels in J (cf. Chs. 20-21); and (b) those which are fairly extensive, but have no J parallels (22:1-14; 40-42; 46:1-4; 50:15-26). In addition, we have indicated the probability that other passages in the Joseph stories are from E (45:2-3, 5-15; 47:1, 2, 7-15, 17-22), but were prevented from making definite identification by the fine literary unity of the whole Joseph narrative. Throughout our discussion, the evidence of the first chapters discussed remained primary in importance, for it was only there that E could be viewed in comparison with J.

We turn now to another group of passages--texts in which J and E narrative strands appear to have been closely intertwined, but which do not display the coherence and homogeneity of the Joseph novelette. Here again we will move in the realm of probability rather than finality, due to the complexity of the redactional process which has brought the traditions into their present appearance of unity.

---

[55] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 427-29.

(a) Gen. 15.--More than one scholar has commented upon the literary complexity of this important chapter, and many have seen in one of the strands the beginning of the Elohist epic.[56] Two major strands were first identified, vv. 1-6 and vv. 7-21;[57] later scholars offered more complex analyses, of which Noth's is typical:[58]

J = vv. 1abβ, 2a, 3b, 4, 6-12, 17, 18, (19-21);

E = vv. 1bα, 3a, 5, 13a (13b), 14abα(14abβ), 15, 16.

Noth, like Gunkel before him, assigns the base narrative to J, with the contrasting E tradition worked in secondarily.[59]

---

[56] Wellhausen, CH, p. 24; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 22f.; Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse*, p. 23; Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 7; Skinner, *op. cit.*, pp. 276f. Skinner typifies the reaction of most scholars when he comments, "The analysis is beset with peculiar, and perhaps insurmountable difficulties."

[57] So in Wellhausen, CH, p. 24.

[58] *Op. cit.*, pp. 29, 38. The verses in parentheses are considered secondary. Gunkel's analysis (*op. cit.*, p. 156) is rather similar: J = vv. 1-6, 9, 10, 12aαb, 17, 18a, bα; E = v. 1, the word במחזה; v. 1b, the words אנכי מגן לך vv. 3a, 5, 11, 12a, 13-16. Glosses = vv. 7-8; in v. 12, the phrase, ארבע מאות שנה in v. 13; the phrase ברכוש גדול in v. 14; v. 18bβγ; vv. 19-21.

In strong contrast to this analysis Volz, as we might expect, assigns the entire chapter to J, asserting that "sehr bezeichnend für J und charakteristisch für die ganze Originalität und Kühnheit dieses grossartigen Erzählers ist auch hier das Nebeneinander zweier so gänzlich verschiedener Erzählungen."[60]

While on the one hand we cannot offer such a complex and minute analysis as that of Gunkel or Noth, we cannot, on the other, agree with Volz. There is good reason to believe that here, as so frequently in the Pentateuch, different narrative traditions reflect different tradition circles. The chief question is whether one of these strands can be assigned with any certainty to E. Our opinion is that we cannot make this identification, even though certain possible indications of E are visible, especially in vv. 1-6.

The introductory phrase, אחר הדברים האלה in 15:1, for example, appears at the beginning of two E narratives elsewhere in Genesis (22:1; 41:1). The revelation through a vision (מחזה) and the implication that Abraham is regarded as a prophet (. . . היה דבר יהוה אל , v. 1a) point even more strongly to E. With this verse has been connected the revelation narrative of vv. 12-16, which likewise implies a night vision or dream and also uses the expression "Amorites" which is often regarded as a sign of E style.[61]

---

[59] Op. cit., p. 29, n. 85.

[60] Op. cit., p. 33.

At the same time, these allegedly E verses contain the name Yahweh (vv. 1, 2, 4, 6, 13), but never use Elohim; they make use of the expression ... היה דבר יהוה אל and the related phrase הנה דבר יהוה אליו (vv. 1, 4), both of which are used elsewhere only in later literature, particularly in the Deuteronomic history.[62]

It is possible, then, that Gen. 15:1-6 contains the remnant of an E tradition of the call of Abraham, but these verses have been so worked over by later writers, under Deuteronomic and prophetic influence, that no more certain and detailed statement about the original tradition can be ventured.[63]

---

[61] Cf. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 190; Noth, ÜSt, pp. 29-30.

[62] The first expression is used frequently in Jer. (cf. Jer. 1:2, 4, 11, 13; 2:2; 13:3, 8; 16:1, etc.) and in the editorial introductions to earlier prophets; cf. Hos. 1:1; Mic. 1:1; Zeph. 1:1. It appears several times in the Deuteronomic history (e.g., I Sam. 15:10; I Kg. 16:1, both with ויהי instead of היה, and in exilic and post-exilic prophetic writings (e.g., Zech. 1:1, 7; Dan. 9:2). The second expression is found nowhere else in the Pentateuch; in the OT it occurs only twice, in the Deuteronomic history (Jg. 3:20; I Kg. 19:9).

The Jacob Narratives, Gen. 26-35

This large narrative complex may be viewed, following Gunkel, as a composite assembled from several smaller collections: (1) The Jacob-Esau stories; (2) The Jacob-Laban cycle; (3) Legends about cult sites founded by Jacob; (4) Stories about the birth and later fortunes of the children of Jacob.[64]

Although some of the older commentators believed that E material could be found throughout these traditions,[65] there is no clear evidence of E before Gen. 28.[66] Accordingly we will begin with the narrative of Jacob's theophany at Bethel, 28:10-22.

(b) Gen. 28:10-22.---The narrative appears to be skilfully woven from two original stories, and it is possible to designate them J and E because of clear criteria. 28:10 connects the story with the preceding J narrative of Ch. 27, so we assign it to J. In the theophany itself, two strands are visible: (a) vv. 11-12, 17-22; (b) vv. 13-16, 19. The former tells of a dream in which Jacob sees the "angels of God" ascending and descending on a "ladder" whose base is the spot where he is sleeping and whose top reaches the sky. Upon awaking Jacob exclaims, "Surely this is no other than the house of God and the gate of heaven." He sets up his stone pillow as a sacred pillar and pours oil on it. Then he vows to return and worship here, if he is preserved on his journey. The use of Elohim in this strand, together with the motif of revelation by dream, point clearly to the E tradition.[67] In fact, the E tradition provides the bulk of this narrative; into it has been inserted the parallel J narrative of the founding of Bethel.

---

[63] Cf. Otto Kaiser, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15," ZAW LXX (1958), pp. 107-126, for a recent attempt to unravel the development of this chapter.

[64] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 258.

[65] Gunkel (op. cit., pp. 257, 270) ascribes 25:29-34 to E, and finds E interwoven with J in Ch. 28.

[66] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., p. 271; Noth, ÜP, p. 30. Wellhausen (CH, p. 32) long ago noted that in Ch. 28 "die beiden Fäden, aus denen JE zusammengewirkt ist, reissen hier nicht ab, sondern setzen sich fort; aber in so enger Verschlingung, dass an eine reinliche Sonderung durchweg nicht zu denken ist. Am besten gelingt die Scheidung in 28:10-22."

The J story, by contrast, uses the Tetragrammaton (vv. 13, 16) and has Yahweh speak directly to Jacob (v. 13), with a repetition of the characteristic Yahwistic form of the promise to the Patriarchs (vv. 13-14; cf. Gen. 12:2f., 7).

---

[67] Gunkel (op. cit., pp. 279-83) considers v. 14 redactional, but the evidence for this sort of minute division here is slight. He also suggests that v. 21b is redactional (so also Noth, UP, p. 38), both because of the appearance of Yahweh in this E context, and because the substance of the vow, centering around the sacred pillar, is complete without the mention of Yahweh as Jacob's God (v. 21b). Certainly it is possible to regard the vow as a whole as substantially E, and to regard 21b as later expansion.

This narrative again illustrates the Elohistic emphasis on revelation through a dream or night vision. Here, however, the dream is only visual; the meaning is conveyed by the symbol of the heavenly ladder, rather than through the divine word. As we shall see, the sanctuary of Bethel has a particular importance for the E tradition, as already suggested by this extensive narrative of the sanctuary's founding by Jacob, with the explicit attempt to legitimize the tithe to be paid there.[68]

(c) Gen. 29:1-30.--In spite of the attempts to divide this section between J and E,[69] no sufficient evidence exists for such analysis. There is no good reason to deny that the narrative as a whole is J.[70]

(d) Gen. 29:31-30:24.--In these traditions about the birth and naming of Jacob's sons, there is considerable evidence of a composite narrative. For example, Elohim appears in 29:2, 6, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23; Yahweh in 29:31,

---

[68] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., p. 281. See below, pp.

[69] Cf. Gunkel, op. cit., pp. 324-29.

[70] Noth, op. cit., p. 30.

32, 33, 35; 30:24. Further, two explanations are given of the names Issachar (30:16, 18), Zebulun (30:20), and Joseph (20:23). Indeed, in the last-mentioned passage Elohim is used with the explanation of "Joseph" as אסף, and Yahweh with the explanation as יסף . Accordingly, it appears that both J and E contained etymologies of the tribal names, and that here they are mixed together. It would be impossible to separate them with any certainty, however,[71] and the results would be of dubious value in any case.

(e) Gen. 30:25-32:3.--Signs which point to considerable E narrative material in this section include (a) the use of Elohim in 31:7, 9, 11 (אל in 13), 16, 24, 42, 50; 32:2, 3;[72] (b) revelation in a dream (חלום) in 31:10f., 24; (c) reference to the E portion of the Bethel narrative, 31:13 (cf. 28:17-18).

The two accounts of Jacob's activity as a sheepbreeder are skilfully joined by the editor so that the first (J) account tells of the events themselves, while the second (E) account(31:4-16) is presented as Jacob's own recital and justification of his actions. But the two differ not only in detail (cf. 31:7-8 with 31:32f.) but in general theological import. Whereas J portrays Jacob simply as a clever and fortunate adversary of Laban, E justifies Jacob's actions as obedience to divine revelation. Both the divine revelation and the idealization of patriarchal mores seem to be hall marks of the E tradition (cf. Gen. 21:3-7, 12). In the account of Jacob's flight (31:17-24), the familiar element of revelation by dream occurs (31:24). Again God is pictured as intervening on behalf of a patriarch (cf. 20:3-7).

---

[71] Noth attempts such a source division; ÜP, pp. 30f.

[72] By contrast, Yahweh is used in the preceding and partly parallel section, 30:25-31:3.

We conclude that the substance of 31:1-24 derives from the E tradition, with vv. 4-16 a clearly unified narrative section containing several important E characteristics.[73]

In the passage which follows, 31:25-32:3, there are several signs of affinity with the E strand. Not only is *Elohim* used absolutely (31:42, 55; 32:1, 2), but the phrase . . . אלהי אברהם, without the identification of the Deity as *Yahweh*, appears several times (31:29, 42, 53).

The only passage in vv. 25-55 which cannot be linked to E with any certainty is the complex covenant account of vv. 43-54. Here there are many signs of a double recension, including the explanation of two place-names (vv. 48b, 49a); the erection of two sacred monuments (vv. 46, 48, 51, 52; and vv. 45, 51, 52); two covenant meals (46b, 54); and two reports of the contents of the treaty (vv. 50, 52). The narrative reflected in vv. 45, 49, 50, 53b, 54, has been most commonly attributed to E,[74] but the basis for this identification (mainly the use of מצבה, which J supposedly avoids[75]) is not sufficient to bear the weight of such a complex analysis.

---

[73] Cf. Noth (*op. cit.*, pp. 30-31), who attributes only vv. 1, 3, 17, 18aα, 19a, 20, 21aαb, 22, 23 to J. Skinner is representative of the critics in the older literature, holding that "1-16 is an almost homogeneous (though perhaps not continuous) excerpt from E . . . /while_/ in 17-54 E still preponderates, though J is more largely represented than some critics . . . allow" (*op. cit.*, p. 394).

In the especially strong and vivid narrative of 31:25-42, which is largely E,[76] the strong ridicule of Laban's household gods is significant as the first open condemnation of pagan religion in the Pentateuch. Laban's gods are so lacking in power and holiness that Rachel sat upon them in her menstrual uncleanness! (cf. Lev. 15:20) No comparable disparaging of pagan gods is found anywhere in J. We must conclude that the E tradition is particularly concerned to oppose pagan religious practices and to ridicule their adherents. This is not at all strange if E is to be linked with early prophetic circles in Israel (cf. I Kg. 18:25-29).

---

[74] Cf. Gunkel, _op_. _cit_., pp. 310f.; Skinner, _op_. _cit_., p. 399. Procksch (_op_. _cit_., pp. 27ff.), however, exactly reverses this analysis, attributing these verses to J.

[75] So Skinner, _op_. _cit_., p. 399.

[76] In addition to the use of _Elohim_, there are several allusions to the E narrative of 31:4-16, the tendency to exonerate Jacob of any blame, and the emphasis on the divine protection which surrounds Jacob in his wanderings (v. 42; cf. 28:20f). Cf. von Rad, _op_. _cit_., p. 304, who comments that "the Elohistic narrative . . . is dominant here and in what follows as far as v. 45."

(f) Gen. 32:3-33:20.--None of the criteria of E so far recognized are found in this section before 33:5.[77] In 33:4-11, recounting the meeting of Jacob with Esau, Elohim is used three times (33:5, 10, 11). There are no other recognizable signs of E in this section, however, and no dislocation or unevenness in the narrative. We must conclude that the whole section is JE, with J as the basis, and E only visible in 33:5-11.[78]

(g) Gen. 34.--Modern critics view this narrative as a literary complex, but are not in agreement on the exact analysis.[79] Several signs of at least two original narratives are found. For example, in vv. 4, 6, 8-10, Hamor represents his sons' interests in trying to win Dinah, while in 11-12 and 19 Shechem himself deals with the sons of Jacob. In vv. 25-26, 30-31, Simeon and Levi alone avenge Dinah, while in 27-29, all the sons of Jacob take part in attacking "Shechem." Further, in the main body of the story Jacob does not appear at all (vv. 13-29). This suggests that the narrative was originally concerned with the Simeon and Levi tribes' attempt to gain a foothold around Shechem in pre-amphictyonic days, and that the connection with the cycle of Jacob narratives is secondary.[80]

---

[77] The use of Elohim in 32 28, 30, is a necessary part of the explanation of the names Penuel and Israel, and shows nothing about the regular usage of the tradition involved.

[78] 33:18-20, or part of it, is attributed by many commentators to E; e.g., Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 52; Skinner, op. cit., p. 412; Gunkel, op. cit., pp. 326f. The main basis for this identification is the apparent connection of the account with Josh. 24:32, which has been assumed by most to be an E tradition. But in view of the difficulty of assigning any part of Joshua to E (see below, p.194), we cannot accept this argument.

At any rate, nothing in the entire narrative points clearly to E material, although it is possible that a combination of J and E narratives led to the present complex account.

(h) Gen. 35:1-8.---There is considerable reason to relate this passage to E. The name Elohim is used three times (vv. 1, 5, 7), and El is used twice (vv. 1, 3). The close connection with the Bethel theophany of 28:10-12,

---

[79] Von Rad, op. cit., p. 325. Noth, for example, regards the chapter as composed of a Yahwistic base and a number of secondary expansions (op. cit., p. 31, n. 99). Skinner sees two parallel narratives, but refuses to identify either as J or E (op. cit., p. 418).

[80] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 329-30; Noth, op. cit., pp. 93-95.

17-22 (E), and with the reference to that event in 31:13 (also E), can be seen by comparing the texts of 28:20b; 35:3b; 31:13; and 35:1b. Verses 16-20 continue the story of the journey of Jacob and his household, and so would appear to be from E, although positive indications are lacking.

That the entire narrative has a definite relation to the establishment of royal worship at Bethel in the time of Jeroboam I is suggested by Albrecht Alt.[81] It is significant, as Alt points out, that E places such stress on the Bethel sanctuary, making it the point of departure and return for the patriarch Jacob; this is one of the strongest suggestions thus far of the North Israelite provenance of E.[82] Northern provenance is also indicated by the phrase, הסירו את אלהי הנכר אשר בתככם in v. 2, which appears almost verbatim in the Northern traditions of Josh. 24:23 and I Sam. 7:3, although it does not indicate any literary connections between E and these traditions.[83]

(5) Summary

We are now in a position to sum up our findings thus far. In the patriarchal narratives of Gen. 12-50 we have isolated E passages in every major section. Dominating these passages is the interest in and acquaintance with prophecy and problems of revelation. Subsidiary motifs are the use of dreams and visions as revelatory media, the idealization of patriarchal behavior, an emphasis on divine guidance, the themes of obedience and testing, and a disparaging of foreign gods.

---

[81] "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," KS I, p. 87.

[82] Ibid., pp. 86ff.; see below, pp. 253ff.

[83] As claimed, for example, by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 358.

We have also pointed to a few purely stylistic features which recur in these traditions; especially notable is the set form in which revelation accounts are cast, as in Gen. 22:1, 11; 46:2. It is significant methodologically, however, that the reliable stylistic constants are so few, compared, say, to the vocabulary tables in the work of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. We believe that we must be cautious about depending upon stylistic features which do not represent any characteristic theological emphasis, for it seems that we are dealing primarily with a school of thought, a circle of particular theological emphasis, rather than with a single writer.

If this means that we are much less certain about attributing isolated verses to specific sources, it also means that we can be quite certain about the identification of the passages which are most important theologically. Among these are certainly the following: Gen. 20:1-18; 21:8-21; 22:1-14; 28:11-12, 17-22; 31:4-16; 35:1-5, 7-8, 14, 16-20; 40; 41; 42 (in large part); 46:1-7; 50:15-26. The hypothesis that E was an important and independent epic tradition receives emphatic support from these passages.

(B) The Exodus and Sinai Covenant Traditions, Ex. 1-34

The separation of the epic strata in the Book of Exodus is notoriously difficult. The criterion of the divine names becomes less available after Ex. 3:14ff., though the E tradition still appears to use Elohim by preference in most passages. Clear signs of composition exist throughout the book, but it is often impossible to go further than the distinction between "JE" and "P." Thus in Exodus, even more than in Genesis, our designation of passages as "E" can only reflect varying degrees of probability.[84]

Even where we are able to distinguish E traditions with considerable certainty, it will become evident that the total amount of E material in Exodus is not nearly so great as the amount of J and P. The explanation for this must be that the editor has taken J as the base narrative, adding variant E traditions only as supplements. The only exception to this is in the Sinai pericope, where the situation is reversed and E is the dominant narrative tradition, the J version of the covenant being displaced to Ch. 34.[85]

---

[84] Cf. G. E. Wright, "Book of Exodus," IDB, Vol. II, pp. 192ff.

(1) Exodus 1-3

The narratives of the birth, early life and call of Moses include some passages which can quite probably be assigned to E. The first clue to the presence of E in Ch. 1 is the contradiction between vv. 15-21 on the one hand, and v. 22 on the other. Two different strategems for getting rid of the Hebrew children are described in these passages.[86] This material contradiction is accompanied by differences in language; vv. 15-20 speak of "the king of Egypt," while v. 22 uses the term "Pharaoh." On this basis alone, v. 22 would appear to stem from the same tradition as vv. 8-12. As for vv. 15-21, we can assign them to E because of the use of *Elohim* and the theme of the fear of God (vv. 17, 20, 21; cf. Gen. 21:11; 22:12; 42:18).[87] Thus, we may see a rough division in the chapter between J's tradition (vv. 8-12, 22) and E's narrative (vv. 15-21), assigning vv. 1-7, 13-14 to P.[88] Typically, in the E passage

---

[85] *Ibid*., p. 194; cf. Noth, *Exodus*, trans. J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), pp. 15, 260.

[86] V. 22 is assigned to J by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit*., Vol. I, p. 81) and by Noth (*UP*, p. 31).

[87] Rudolph's explanation of the use of *Elohim* here is that the midwives are Egyptians, and hence cannot be expected to fear Yahweh. This necessitates reading מילדת העברית in v. 15 as "the midwives of the Hebrews" rather than "the Hebrew midwives." Such a proposal suggests the amount of strained interpretation which is necessary if one is determined to eliminate an Elohistic tradition from the Pentateuch (*Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua*, p. 3).

> fear of God proves to be a real factor in history, and God afterwards gives express and visible confirmation to the midwives that this fear of God was the right course, and that he stands with those who fear him against all earthly power, by 'dealing well' with them.[89]

The account of Moses' birth and rescue from the Nile in Ch. 2 has commonly been attributed to E,[90] although more recently this has been disputed by Noth.[91] Mention of God is lacking; the "E criteria" cited by older scholars, including the use of אמה in v. 5, point as much to J as to E.[92] In fact, the motif of placing the child in the Nile appears to be a continuation of 1:22, which is probably J, and stands in contrast to the E presentation in 1:15-21.

---

[88] Cf. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 81ff.; S. R. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 22. This is essentially the conclusion of most commentators, although there have been attempts to find E in vv. 8-12; Procksch, *op. cit.*, pp. 60f., designates vv. 11a-12 as E.

[89] Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 23f.

[90] So Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 81ff.

[91] Noth (*Exodus*, p. 25) assigns the entire tradition to J.

[92] On the use of אמה as a criterion for E, see above, pp. 101f., n. 13. The phrase "conceived and bore a son" (. . . ותלד . . . ותהר) in v. 2, cited by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 81) as a mark of E, is used by J in the same way in Gen. 4:1; 4:17; 16:4; 19:36; 21:2; 25:21 and in ten other passages, according to their own vocabulary tables! (*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 186).

The story of the call of Moses and the revelation of the divine name Yahweh in Ch. 3 is clearly composite. For example, the Deity twice declares that he has seen the oppression of his people (vv. 7, 9), and twice announces their deliverance (vv. 8, 10). In this passage there are definite signs of E style:

v. 1b הר האלהים חרבה[93]
v. 4 ויקרא אליו אלהים ויאמר משה ויאמר הנני[94]
v. 6b כי ירא מהביט אל האלהים[95]
v. 11a ויאמר משה אל האלהים
v. 12 תעבדון את האלהים

In addition, we note the use of Elohim in vv. 13, 14, 15.

---

[93] The use of חרב for "Sinai" has long been regarded as a mark of E's style; cf. the tables of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 186, showing "Horeb" as a consistent feature of the style of Deuteronomy as well. Recently, however, Noth has denied the force of these arguments, pointing out the decidedly secondary position of the term "Horeb" in the three E passages in Exodus where it appears, Ex. 3:1; 17 6; 33:6 (ÜSt, p. 29). The writer finds Noth's analysis convincing. If these passages are to be assigned to E, we must do so on other grounds than the use of "Horeb."

[94] This form of revelatory address is one of the most important marks of E; cf. the comments above, pp. 107f. on the occurrences of the formula in Genesis.

[95] Note the conjunction of Elohim with the motif of fear; cf. above, p. 109.

Verses 13-15 are most crucial, for here the Elohist stresses the introduction of the name Yahweh at the time of Moses, accounting thereby for the use of Elohim in the preceding narratives.[96] There is, however, some unevenness in the text, especially in the connection of vv. 14 and 15. The "moreover" (עוד) which introduces v. 15 sounds suspiciously editorial. It would appear that since the direct answer to the question of v. 13 is found in v. 15, v. 14 must be an addition to the original narrative, with the purpose of explaining the name Yahweh etymologically. The עוד of v. 15a would then be redactional, added after the insertion of v. 14.[97]

The E portion of Ex. 3, then, is found in vv. 1, 4b, 9-13, 15. It is significant that this tradition understands Moses' call as the call of a prophet, as is indicated by the clear parallel with the story of Samuel's call in I Sam. 3, and more remote relationships with the call of Jeremiah, Jer. 1.[98] Whereas in J Moses simply conveys news of the coming deliverance of Israel, here Moses' more substantial role includes an actual part in the event of deliverance: he is to bring Israel out of Egypt (v. 10). Moses is thus depicted, like Samuel and Elijah, in a role which combines political and military leadership with the office of a divine messenger.[99] The name Yahweh is given to legitimate the message of this prophetic leader, but also to assure the trustworthiness of the divine power and presence.

---

[96] Cf. the analogous explanation of Yahweh's name in P, Ex. 6:2-3.

[97] So Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 83. Noth earlier took the opposite view, and assigned v. 14 to E, v. 15 to a later editor (ÜP, p. 39), but in a more recent writing (Exodus, pp. 43f.) he has modified this view as follows: "We should regard the simple giving of the name in v. 15 as an original answer to the question at the end of v. 13, in the same way as the sentence in v. 15b, 'this is my name for ever' will then take up the question, 'What is his name?' in v. 13. Verse 14a would then have been added subsequently as an explanation of the name Yahweh and would have been inserted into the context because of 14b which verbally anticipates the following clause."

(2) Exodus 4-12

The narrative of the empowering of Moses to work signs in 4:1-23 contains only a few verses which appear to belong to E, vv. 17, 18, and 20b. These verses are marked by the delivering to Moses of a rod, described in v. 20b as מטה האלהים, whereby he shall do signs. In the contrasting J tradition, vv. 1-12, the rod is only used in the first sign. This E tradition further contrasts with J in that Moses returns to Egypt alone, taking with him the rod (vv. 18, 20b; cf. Ex. 18:2ff.), while in J he takes his wife and children with him (vv. 19, 20a).[100]

---

[98] Cf. Murray Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. B. W. Anderson & W. Harrelson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 94-97; see below, pp. 220ff.

[99] Cf. Noth, Exodus, pp. 40-41.

[100] Ibid., p. 47.

The older commentators found, in the passages just discussed (Ex. 1-6), means whereby E passages in the plague narratives (Ex. 7-12) might be distinguished. First, the rod given to Moses as a means of working signs (4:17) appears later as a miracle-working instrument in the hand of Moses (7:20b; 9:23; 10:13; cf. 10:22). On the basis of Moses' use of the rod, it is suggested, these verses ought to be assigned to E.

A second peculiarity which has been thought to point to E in the plague narratives is the way the Hebrews are depicted as living in close proximity to their Egyptian neighbors in passages such as Ex. 3:22; 10:21-23; 11:2. This intermingling of Hebrews with Egyptians, found also in P (Gen. 47:11), is contrasted with J's picture of them settled in the land of Goshen (Gen. 45:10), where they are removed by distance from the effects of the plague (Ex. 8:18 /EV 8:22 /; 9:26).

Using these two alleged criteria, scholars assigned fragments of the plague narratives of Ex. 7-12 to E; viz., 7:15, 17b, 20b, 23; 9:8-12, 19-23a, 24a, 25a, 31, 35; 10:12-13a, 14a, 15b, 20-23; 11:1-3.[101]

---

[101] So Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 275; Vol. II, pp. 88-89. This analysis is typical of older critics; cf. Holzinger, *Exodus*, HCAT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1900), pp. xvif., assigning to E 7:15b, 17b, 20aβb, 21a, 23; finding "traces" in 8:8-10; 9:22, 23a, 24a, 35aαb; 10:12, 13aαγ, 14aα, 21-23, 24aαβ, 25, 27; 11:1-3.

It is questionable whether such analysis is profitable when the results are so meager and so precarious. J appears to furnish the framework of the plague stories with an account of seven plagues, while the P tradition supplements these and rounds off the number of plagues to ten.[102] Even if there are also a few fragments which can be distinguished from the basic J-P narrative and assigned to E, they are not of sufficient clarity to justify minute analysis.[103]

(3) Exodus 13-17

Scholars have assigned only fragments of Ex. 13-17 to the E tradition. Driver, for example, designated as E only 13:17-19; 14:10b, 16aα, 19, 20a; 15:20-25, 27; 17:1b-2b, 4-6, 8-16.[104] In a very similar analysis, Holzinger attributed these fragments to E:[105] 13:17-19; 14:15aβ, 16a, 19a, 21b?, (22?), 23, 25a (26?) 27a?, 31aβb; 15:20-21; 17:8-16; 14:16a, 23 are attributed to E only "in part."

---

[102] G. E. Wright, "The Plagues in Exodus," IDB, Vol. III, pp. 823f. Cf. Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 68ff.

[103] Noth (*op. cit.*, p. 70) denies any E passages in these sections. Wright concludes, "It must be admitted, however, that in themselves the passages in question are too fragmentary, and the criteria for distinguishing them too imprecise, to make it entirely certain that a third document (E) is definitely to be distinguished in the plague narratives." (*op. cit.*, p. 824).

[104] *The Book of Exodus*, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), pp. 105-161.

[105] *Op. cit.*, p. xvii.

Noth designates as E only 13:17-19; 14:5a, 7, 11, 12, 19a, 25a; 17:3.[106]

In regard to these passages there is general agreement on only one, 13:17-19. The ascription to E of these verses is probably correct, since *Elohim* is used four times and since the passage alludes to the E tradition of Gen. 50:25f. by the mention of Joseph's bones being brought out of Egypt by the departing Hebrews.[107] The tradition is remarkable in its depiction of the Hebrews as armed for battle (חמשים, v. 18).[108]

In Ex. 14 we cannot be at all certain that E narrative material forms part of the complex of traditions. The surprising statement that the Hebrews *fled* from Egypt (v. 5a) can be connected with E only on the basis of the expression "king of Egypt," instead of "Pharaoh" as in v. 5b (cf. 1:15, E). Verse 19a appears to be an E fragment, because of the mention of the "angel of *Elohim*" protecting the Hebrews (cf. J's "pillar of cloud" and "pillar of fire" in 13:20f.;

---

[106] UP, p. 39.

[107] Cf. the tradition in Josh. 24:32 that the bones of Joseph were finally buried in a tomb at Shechem.

[108] Cf. the other occurrences of this apparently rare expression, always in this form, in Josh. 1:14; 4:12; Jg. 7:11. It is also often conjectured as an emendation for חשים in Num. 32:17; cf. F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 332; cf. Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

(14:19b). Again, the fragments are so small, and their identification so tenuous, that no important discussion can spring from them.[109]

There is no question about the antiquity and importance of the great Hymn at the Sea, Ex. 15:1b-18. But it stands independent of all the narrative strands in its presentation of the event of deliverance and is probably earlier in formulation than either J or E.[110] If the song comes to us as part of the J tradition,[111] then vv. 20-21 might represent the parallel title or incipit of the hymn in the E tradition.[112]

Nothing in the remaining verses of Ch. 15 points clearly to E. Verse 25b fits poorly in its context, and is presumably a fragment of a once longer account of law-giving and testing. It has often been assigned to E on the basis of the occurrence of נסה as in Gen. 22:1.[113] But the verb may be just a play on the name מסה (17:7).[114] Originally, the reference was probably to a place of legal transactions, as suggested by the use of חק , משפט , and the dispensing of law--a place like the עין משפט of Gen. 14:17.[115] Finally, 15:26 has many contacts with Deuteronomic theology and style, but none directly with E.[116]

---

[109] Noth, however, believes that the statement that the Hebrews fled from Egypt (14:5a) can be attributed to E, and that this is an important fragment of "what is doubtless a very old form of the Exodus tradition" (Exodus, pp. 111-12).

[110] See F. M. Cross, Jr. and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," JNES XIV (1955), pp. 237ff.

[111] So A. Weiser, Introduction, p. 106.

[112] So Cross and Freedman, op. cit., p. 238.

[113] Cf. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 104; Driver, Exodus, p. 143.

Traces of E do not appear again until Ch. 17.[117] There it is quite clear that two accounts are interwoven, recounting a rebellion against Moses (vv. 1b-7), and a battle with the Amalekites (vv. 8-16).

Doublets in the account of the ריב or complaint against Moses include vv. 1b-2, as opposed to v. 3. Both passages tell of the lack of water and the people's complaint (v. 2, ריב; v. 3, לון). V. 3 presumes a geographical setting which has been excised (שם); v. 2 lacks any mention of place. The account in v. 3 appears to be continued in the following passage, vv. 4-7.[118] The use of the miracle-working rod of Moses points to E as the source of this passage.[119] The narrative of vv. 4-7, then, is part of an E version of the common and widespread tradition that the Hebrews constantly rebelled against Moses and Yahweh in the wilderness (cf. Num. 20:1-3; Dt. 6:16; 8:16; 9:22).

---

[114] Noth, *Exodus*, p. 129.

[115] Cf. Georg Beer, *Exodus, mit einem Beitrag von Kurt Galling* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1939), p. 86.

[116] E.g., "hearken to the voice," Dt. 15:5; 28:1; "Yahweh thy God," Dt. 1:21, 31, *et passim*; "that which is right," Dt. 6:18; 22:25, 28; "give ear," Dt. 1:45; "commandments and statutes," 4:40; 6:17; 10:13, *et passim*. See the vocabulary tables in S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, ICC (New York: Chas. Scribner's, 1895), pp. lxxvii-xcv.

[117] Although Carpenter and Harford-Battersby assign a fragment of the quails and manna story (16:4) to E on the following basis: (a) There seem to be two accounts of Yahweh's promising food, in 17:4 and in 17:11; (b) V. 11 is part of the P account (cf. v. 10), and therefore v. 4 is either E or J; (c) v. 4 is E because of the theme of testing, which also appears in Gen. 22:1; Ex. 15:25b (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 104f.). But in the absence of any stronger evidence than this we cannot identify the fragment as E. Noth assigns this verse, along with vv. 28-31, to J (*Exodus*, p. 132); so also Driver, *Exodus*, p. 146.

The narrative concerning the battle of the Hebrews with Amalek in vv. 8-16 is usually attributed to E because of the rod which Moses wields (v. 9; cf. vv. 11-12).[120] The story is an old tradition of holy war set in the desert period. It would fit better in the Wandering narratives of

---

[118] We may, with Noth (Exodus, pp. 137-39), regard 2c, 7c, and "Massah" in 7a as additions to the original narrative, which explained the place name "Meribah" by the verb ריב. This would mean that another tradition about the spring which is called "Massah" in Ex. 15:25b has been secondarily introduced here.

[119] Ex. 3:17. Against Noth, who thinks "Horeb" is a later addition and that the rod is to be associated with the J plague story in Ex. 7:17, 20a (Exodus, pp. 139-40). Hence, Noth assigns only v. 3 to E (UP, p. 39, n. 137). Driver (Exodus, p. 157) assigns vv. 4-6 to E; Holzinger (Exodus, p. xvii) designates the same verses as "JE."

[120] So Holzinger, op. cit., p. 60. But contrast Noth (Exodus, pp. 141-42) who thinks "rod of God" is an addition to the original narrative, which he thinks may be J.

Numbers, where Joshua is the designated successor of Moses; his apperance here without introduction is rather sudden. The stress upon the early leadership of Joshua, however, characterizes the E strand in Exodus; it is reflected also in E's version of the Sinai covenant tradition (see below).

We can note also that E again shows a definite tendency to exalt the position of Moses; his elevation of the rod is necessary for victory. This motif was seen in the story of Moses' call, where he is given the rod and empowered to lead the Hebrews out of bondage (Ex. 3:12f.; 4:17, 20).

(4) Exodus 18

The evidence indicates that in Ex. 18 we are dealing with a tradition primarily E which has been supplemented and expanded by a redactor.[121] That the narrative developed in this manner, rather than through a combining of sources, is shown by the impossibility of constructing two or more parallel accounts from the chapter. Moses' father-in-law arrives with Moses' children, meets with Moses, hears the news concerning God's deliverance of the Hebrews, offers sacrifice, and shares a covenant meal with Aaron and Moses (vv. 1-12). Afterwards, Jethro observes Moses' administration of community legal affairs, and suggests a reform, which is then carried out (vv. 13-28).[122] Nowhere is there any sign of the juxtaposition of two parallel accounts.

---

[121] Cf. the brief discussion by Noth in ÜP, p. 39, n. 138, and in Exodus, pp. 145-50. See also W. F. Albright, "Jethro, Hobab, and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition," CBQ XXV:1 (1963), pp. 1-11.

In fact, the original narrative tradition has been supplemented at two main points, vv. 1b and 8-11.[123] Both of these supplements have the same pious motive: to amplify the actions of Yahweh in saving his people from Egypt. In these portions of the text, significantly, the name Yahweh is used six times (vv. 1b, 8, 9, 10, 11). Elsewhere, *Elohim* is consistently used (vv. 1a, 5, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23) for a total of eleven times. This use of *Elohim*, together with two other characteristic E motifs (יראי אלהים ; הר האלהים , vv. 5, 21) appear to make the identification as E secure. Other supplements may occur in vv. 2b, 3b-4, as Noth thinks,[124] although such an explanation of the meaning of a name can be early as well as late in Hebrew literature.

---

[122] R. W. Knierim, "Die Neuordnung der mosäischen Gerichtsbarkeit," ZAW, N.F. XXXII (1961), attempts to relate this reform to the later history of Israel.

[123] The exact extent of the supplements in v. 8 is impossible to determine with certainty. Probably most of the verse is secondary; but see Noth, who claims 8aβ and 8bβ are supplements (*Exodus*, p. 145). Noth also points to the use of the name Jethro in vv. 9-11, where elsewhere in the chapter it is "Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses" (vv. 1, 2, 6, 12a), or simply "his father-in-law" (vv. 7, 24) as a sign of supplementary material (*Ibid*., pp. 146-47).

[124] Noth, ÜP, p. 39.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

(5) The Sinai Pericope, Ex. 19-34

The section of the Hebrew Bible relating the covenant at Sinai has undergone the most complex and tangled literary development of any portion of the Scriptures. This is certainly not surprising, in view of the extreme importance which the covenant assumed, historically and theologically, in Israel.[125] The complexity and confusion of traditions, however, renders absolute certainty impossible when we undertake to separate the various strands which have gone into the final web of law and narrative.

Here we are only concerned with isolating, with whatever degree of probability we can attain, the materials to be identified as E. Our task is made somewhat more manageable by the possibility of disposing of certain passages--in addition to acknowledged P material--which do not require consideration as part of the E narrative.[126]

(a) Decalogue and Covenant Code.--First of all there is the question of the literary status of the Decalogue,

---

[125] Cf. G. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and in the Ancient Near East; W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. I, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 36-69.

[126] Cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 189; Driver, Introduction, p. 37; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 276; Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 100; Noth, ÜP, pp. 7-19; W. Beyerlin, Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen, pp. 4-8. These sources show substantial agreement in relating the following passages to P: 19:1-2a; 24:15b-18a; 25-31; 31:18a; 34:29-35; 35-40.

Ex. 20:1-17. Older commentators almost unanimously assigned the Ten Commandments to the E stratum. This identification was based on the use of *Elohim* in the introductory sentence (20:1), and even more on the assumption that the "E document" was the product of the "ethical monotheism" of the 8th-century prophetic movement in Israel. Since the Decalogue supposedly represented the sort of advanced ethical thought attributed to the E document generally, and since it was felt that the whole Sinai account must be divided among J, E, and P with no remainder, the ascription of the Decalogue to E seemed obvious.[127]

This view must be corrected in the light of modern research into the history of Israel's religion. Mendenhall has shown that the Old Testament covenant narratives and related passages bear a striking formal resemblance to Hittite state vassal-treaties of the late second millennium B.C.[128] Some form of the Ten Commandments could go back to the Mosaic era.[129] The attribution of the Decalogue and of the Covenant itself to the epoch of the classical prophets is thus proven wrong.[130] And, as we are arguing, the attribution of the E tradition to this late period is also wrong.

---

[127] Procksch (*op. cit.*, pp. 88f.) puts forward typical arguments in which the E tradition is related to 8th-century prophecy and the Decalogue is viewed as a reflex of this prophetic movement. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 111) state: "The Ten Words . . . are almost unanimously assigned in the present redaction to E." Cf. the opinion of Pfeiffer (*op. cit.*, p. 230): "No, the Ten Commandments do not represent the prophetic teaching in its inspired purity, but rather a Deuteronomic compromise between the prophetic religion of right motives and the priestly religion of ritual observances." See also the discussion of Eissfeldt (*Einleitung*, p. 256), who argues "Weiter haben wir beobachtet dass unbeschadet der sonst zwischen E und J bestehenden grossen Ähnlichkeit, E doch starke Korrekturen an den von J vorausgesetzten religiös-settlichen Anschauungen vornimmt. Dazu würde die Tatsache, dass E den kultischen Dekalog des J durch einen ethischen, die Ackerbaufeste offenbar bewusst übergehenden Dekalog ersetzt hat, gut passen, wie ja auch das in mancher Hinsicht auf E's Schultern stehende Deuteronomium in seiner Festgesetzgebung (16:1-17) die Ackerbaufeste ursprünglich nicht berücksichtigt zu haben scheint." See also the discussion of Bentzen, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 54.

This does not mean that the Ten Commandments are after all E, for the conclusion of the literary critics was probably incorrect on purely literary grounds as well. Apart from the introductory phrase in 20:1 there is no use of Elohim in the Decalogue; on the contrary, Yahweh appears throughout. Furthermore, there is no necessary literary connection between the Decalogue and any narrative strand in the Sinai account. Its lack would not be felt at all if it were removed from its present context. Indeed, the connection between 19:25 and 20:18 would be improved by such an omission.[131]

---

[128] Cf. Mendenhall, op. cit., pp. 31-44; Baltzer, op. cit., pp. 19-47.

[129] See the summary by H. H. Rowley, "Moses and the Decalogue," BJRL XXXIV (1951), pp. 81-118; cf. J. J. Stamm, Le Décalogue à la lumière des recherches contemporaines, French trans. by P. Reymond (Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959). A. Alt's article, "Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts," KS I, pp. 278-332, paved the way for modern re-evaluation of the Decalogue. Cf. the comments of Albright, FSAC, pp. 257-72; A. Bentzen, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 54-55.

[130] Cf. Mendenhall's discussion of the new orientation in the study of Israel's religious development in "Biblical History in Transition," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, pp. 32-49.

Some of the same observations can be made about the literary status of the "Covenant Code," Ex. 20:22-23:33. The introductory passage, 20:22, uses the name Yahweh. Thus there is no connection with the preceding verses (18-21), which use *Elchim*. The motif of Yahweh's speaking to the people from heaven, also in v. 22, has no parallel in either the J or the E Sinai narratives; in J Yahweh comes down (ירד) to the mountain, while in E he is enthroned upon it and Moses goes up to meet him.[132]

---

[131] Noth, *Exodus*, p. 154. Recently, however, some have argued that the Decalogue (in a pre-Priestly form) fits well into E's narrative if (a) 20:18-21 is placed before 20:1-17; and (b) Ex. 24:3-8 is ascribed to E, the ספר הברית and the דברים of 24:3, 4, 7, 8 being understood as references to the Decalogue; cf. Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-57; Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-62. (In addition to the literary considerations, Beyerlin emphasizes the parallels with the Hittite treaties, arguing that such a covenant formula as is reflected in the E narrative would naturally include some form of commands, analogous to the stipulations of the treaties.) The repeated use of *Yahweh* in 24:3-8, however, precludes our assigning it to E, and we cannot argue that E *should* have and therefore *did* include a series of commands, knowing as little as we do about the actual history of the Sinai traditions. The E narrative which we propose below, including only 19:2b-3a, 4-6, 16-17, 19; 20:18-21; 24:1-2, 9-15a, 18b, is all that we can with certainty attribute to E.

[132] Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 175-76.

It has been assumed that the ספר הברית of 24:7 is to be identified with the Covenant Code. But the covenant-ceremony narrative of which 24:7 is a part is not demonstrably related to either J or E. That it is not E is suggested by the repeated use of Yahweh (24:3, 4, 5, 7, 8). The narrative of 24:3-8, if it does refer to the Covenant Code, may have been introduced into the Sinai complex along with the Covenant Code as a secondary expansion.[133]

The internal evidence adduced for assigning the Covenant Code to E is similarly unconvincing. For example, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby state that the "judgments" (משפטים) of 24:3 are derived from the Elohistic source because of

> "their use of Elohim, 21:6, 13; 22:8, 11 (LXX); 22:28; . . . and other linguistic marks such as the designation of אמה for 'bondwoman' . . . and the repeated use of the words בעל and of דבר in the sense of 'matter' or 'cause.'"[134]

The mentioned uses of Elohim, even if we accept without cavil the LXX reading in 22:11, reflect no more than the precisely cognate and analogous uses of ilu in the Mesopotamian law codes. The meaning of "god" is very stereotyped and unspecific in both cases; in the Covenant Code it is simply a mark of the close relation of the code to ancient Near Eastern case law.[135]

---

[133] Ibid., pp. 198-99.

[134] Op. cit., II, p. 113.

[135] A. Alt, op. cit., pp. 294-95; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 215.

The other linguistic criteria alleged by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby are not actually such as to show characteristic E vocabulary in the Covenant Code, since many of the words and expressions cited occur primarily or solely in the Covenant Code. Examination of the same authors' vocabulary tables shows that seven of the sixteen listed occurrences of אמה fall in the Covenant Code; all five of the appearances of מות יומת are found there. Eleven of the eighteen cited occurrences of בעל are found in the Covenant Code, while six of the nine uses of the expression איש אל רעהו appear there. Ten of the twenty appearances of the root גנב appear in the Decalogue and Covenant Code; eight of the remaining uses occur in Gen. 30-31; surely the reason for this concentration is subject matter rather than "characteristic E vocabulary!" Not only do these vocabulary items not prove that the Decalogue and Covenant Code are E; they cast further doubt on the whole method behind the compilation and use of these frequently cited tables.

For lack, therefore, of both external and internal evidence, we exclude both the Decalogue and the Covenant Code from our consideration, and pass to the actual covenant narratives.[136]

---

[136] Among the most interesting sections of the Covenant Code, and the most significant for a study of E, is the concluding exhortation, 23:20-33, which may be compared with the

(b) Exodus 19-20.--Even scholars who do not see two continuous epic narratives in these chapters point to the composite nature of the account.[137] Particularly in Ch. 19 is composition evident: three times Moses goes up on the mountain and returns; what he does on these journeys is not reported (vv. 3, 8, 20). Yahweh commands Moses to set bounds to keep the people from touching the mountain (v. 12), but later must be reminded of his command (v. 23). Whether Moses alone, Moses and Aaron, or Moses and all of the people receive the words of Yahweh is not clear (vv. 9, 17, 24).[138]

The older scholars explained these inconsistencies by a literary analysis which divided Ch. 19 between the two epic sources, with an introduction by the P redactor. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby offer the following analysis:[139]

---

hortatory conclusions of Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code (so Driver, Exodus, p. 247). If we could identify this passage as the contribution of the E tradition this would indicate an extremely close relation of the E school to the Deuteronomic circles, for points of contact with Deuteronomic style and phraseology have long been noted in the passage (cf. Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, ad. loc.; Beyerlin, op. cit., p. 9). But the obviously complex history of this passage, like that of the Covenant Code as a whole, cannot be traced.

[137] See W. Rudolph, "Der Aufbau von Exodus 19-34," Werden und Wesen des AT (BZAW 66 /Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936/), pp. 41-48.

[138] A detailed listing of the inconsistencies is given by Driver in his Exodus, p. 168; cf. Noth, Exodus, pp. 153ff.

[139] Op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 109-111.

J	E	P	R^d
11b-13	2b	1-2a	3-8
18	7-11a		
20-25	14-17		
	19		

S. R. Driver's analysis, while similar, does not make use of the theory of a Deuteronomic redactor:[140]

J	E	P
3b-9	2b-3a	1-2a
11b-13	10-11a	
18	14-17	
20-25	19	

It can be seen that the main disagreement concerns vv. 3-8.

Rudolph's treatment begins, of course, by dispensing with E. Then vv. 3b-8 and 20-24 are excised as later additions. Rudolph claims that the remaining verses stand as a unified J narrative, if only we place v. 20 before v. 19. The differences in the divine names are explained as expressing desired dramatic effects: the Elohim of vv. 17, 19 expresses more strikingly the confrontation with the mysterium tremendum than would Yahweh.[141]

We have indicated elsewhere that this treatment of the variation in divine names is not satisfactory. Rudolph's treatment of vv. 20-24 as a later addition, however, merits consideration. In fact, his description of vv. 20-24 as "eine Art Midrasch zu v. 12-13" can be accepted as most accurate.[142] These verses are intended to answer the question of later priests as to whether the warnings of vv. 12-14 apply even to the priestly class.[143]

---

[140] Introduction, pp. 30-32.

[141] "Der Aufbau von Exodus 19-34," pp. 41-42, 48.

More difficult problems arise in connection with vv. 3b-8.[144] The elevated style of this passage, with its *parallelismus membrorum*, makes it stand out from the surrounding prose narrative.[145] The heart of the passage (vv. 4-6) is clearly a reflective summary of the covenant theology; the rhythmic style suggests a liturgical background, perhaps in the covenant-renewal ceremonies.[146] These observations, and the parallels with Deuteronomic language,[147] have led some scholars to agree with Rudolph in thinking that the passage represents a secondary expansion under Deuteronomic influence.[148]

---

[142] *Ibid*., p. 41. Similarly, Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 154, 160. Noth also includes v. 25 in this secondary material.

[143] Rudolph, *Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua*, p. 41. Beyerlin (*op. cit*., pp. 12-13) concurs in this judgment, although he is inclined to include v. 20 also as part of the expansion.

[144] Verses 3a and 3b are clearly doublets; note the use of *Elohim* in 3a and of *Yahweh* in 3b.

[145] Noth, *op. cit*., pp. 157-59.

[146] J. Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," VT IX:4 (1959), pp. 351-57.

[147] See Driver, *Exodus*, p. 170. Among the parallels noted are "eagles' wings" (על כנפי נשרים), cf. Dt. 32:10, 11; "hearken to" (אם שמוע תשמעו), cf. Dt. 11:13; 15:5; 28:1; "a peculiar possession (סגלה), cf. Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18; "a holy nation" (וגוי קדוש), cf. Dt. 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19; "a holy people" (עם קדוש).

Two considerations make an identification as E more plausible: (a) The Deuteronomic parallels appear to derive from and expand upon this passage, rather than the reverse;[149] (b) It is quite unlikely that there are any Deuteronomic passages in the Tetrateuch.[150] The many similarities between E and D indicate that they are closely related Northern schools of tradition, and it is probable that many "Deuteronomic" passages in the Tetrateuch belong to some stratum of the E tradition, rather than to D.[151]

If the passage is ascribed to E, the theological motifs are consistent with Elohistic themes so far discussed. The emphasis on the goal of Israel's history as specifically religious, the stress on obedience, and the centrality of the covenant are entirely understandable in the prophetic or prophetic-Levitical circles which we shall propose as bearers of the E tradition.[152]

---

[148] So Noth, op. cit., p. 157; Beyerlin, op. cit., pp. 10-13.

[149] See Driver, op. cit., p. 171; Muilenburg, op. cit., pp. 351-53.

[150] On the separateness of the Tetrateuch from the Deuteronomic History, see Noth, ÜSt, pp. 180-216. Cf. G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, Vol. II, p. 320: . . . "The view that there was a thorough Deuteronomic redaction of JE appears increasingly subjective and difficult to prove."

[151] G. E. Wright, loc. cit.; J. Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 351.

In the remainder of Chs. 19-20 (accepting the common ascription of 19:1-2a to P), the variation in the divine names can be taken as a starting point in separating the narrative strands. *Elohim* appears in 19:3a, 17, 19; 20:19, 20, 21. Are there any constant motifs which accompany the use of *Elohim* in these verses?

(a) In v. 3a Moses "goes up to God," to be addressed by Israel's covenant lord (vv. 4-6); in v. 17 he brings the people to the mountain to meet God where, terrified by the theophany, they ask Moses to act as their spokesman (20:19); Moses then draws nearer to speak with God (20:21). The significance of these approaches to God can be seen by comparing 19:9, 11, 18, 20. In the latter verses the name Yahweh is used, and Yahweh is depicted as coming down to (ירד על) Mount Sinai. In contrast, the verses using *Elohim* picture God as dwelling upon (or enthroned upon, ישב) the mountain. This conception of the mountain as the dwelling place and throne of God, to which Moses and the people go up for revelation, is the first constant which unites the E fragments.

---

[152] See below, pp. 253-66.

(b) A contrast can also be seen in the theophanies connected with the two divine names. In 19:16; 20:18, 21, the theophany consists of "thunder and lightning" (קלת וברקים); a "thick cloud" (ענן כבד);"the voice of the _shophar_" (קל שפר); and "flashes" (לפידם). But in the parallel theophany of Yahweh, there is "smoke" (עשן); "fire" (אש); and the "trembling" (חרד) of the mountain. Thus, the unique features of the theophany of _Elohim_ are the call of the _shophar_, the thick cloud, and the קלת or thunderings.

(c) The verses using _Elohim_ emphasize the role of the people. They are brought out of the camp to meet God, taking their stand at the foot of the mountain (19:17). Only when the people are too frightened by the stormy theophany do they appoint Moses to act for them (20:18-20). By contrast, the people are forbidden to approach the mountain at all in the account using the name Yahweh; instead, Yahweh himself appoints Moses and comes to speak to him alone, as in 19:9.[153]

There are, then, some constants which distinguish the narrative fragments which employ _Elohim_ from those using the Tetragrammaton. Through these motifs we can distinguish 19:2b-3a, 4-6, 16-17, 19 as a brief but coherent E narrative.

---

[153] See Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, _op. cit._, Vol. II, pp. 109-111; cf., for a recent treatment, Murray Newman, _The People of the Covenant_ (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 39-55.

The narrative strand thus ascribed to E finds its continuation in 20:18-21. The latter verses are connected with the E traditions of Ch. 19 by the use of *Elohim*, by the description of the theophany (cf. 20:18 with 19:16, 19), and by the prominent position given to the people (cf. 19:18 with 20:18-19). As in the earlier E fragments, God is depicted as dwelling upon the mountain (cf. 20:21 with 19:3a). Two themes previously noted in Elohistic passages elsewhere appear here as well: the emphasis on religious awe or "fear" (יראתו , v. 20), and the motif of divine "testing" (נסות אתכם , v. 20).

(c) Ex. 24.--Ch. 24, narrating the ceremonial conclusion of the covenant, contains two very different accounts, vv. 1-2, 9-11 and vv. 3-8. Verses 3-8, in spite of the frequent use of *Yahweh*, may not be J; instead, the passage may have been introduced into the Sinai pericope along with the Covenant Code.[154] At any rate, there is no legitimate reason for assigning vv. 3-8 to E, in spite of the almost unanimous agreement of past scholars that these verses contain the E covenant narrative.[155]

---

[154] So Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 198-99; but contrast Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, pp. 253-61; Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-78; see above, p. 153.

[155] Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-99. But Rudolph ("Der Aufbau von Exodus 19-34," pp. 46-48) is also incorrect in ascribing the passage to J. J's covenant narrative is contained in Ex. 34. Cf. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

It is in vv. 1-2, 9-11 that we find E's account of the sealing of the covenant. The identification of the passage as E is supported by the use of Elohim in the climactic verse 11 (cf. Yahweh in v. 10), as well as by the community's sharing, through its representative elders, in the sacred covenant meal (cf. "c," p. 160 , above). We might also note the use of the verb חזה (v. 11), which suggests that a prophetic type of revelation was received by the elders on the mountain.[156] The tradition itself, enigmatic and fragmentary in its present form, is of the greatest antiquity.[157]

The remainder of Ch. 24 falls into two parts, vv. 12-15a, 18b; and vv. 15b-18a. The latter is recognized as the P introduction to the account of the Tabernacle, Chs. 25-31.[158] Verses 12-15a, 18b serve an important function as a bridge to the narrative of Chs. 32-34. The expression הר האלהים (v. 13) suggests E, as does the apparent connection between the elders of v. 14 and the elders mentioned in 24:1-2, 9-11. But there is some confusion, too:

---

[156] Cf. Num. 24:4, 16 (also E); Isa. 1:1; 2:1; Amos 1:1; Mic. 1:1.

[157] Beyerlin, op. cit., pp. 44-57.

[158] Beer, Exodus, p. 128. Rudolph, Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua, p. 48, identifies vv. 16-18a as P, as does Driver, Exodus, p. 251.

Joshua has not previously been mentioned in the Sinai accounts as Moses' minister (משרתו). He has, however, appeared in that capacity in the E tradition of Ex. 17:8-16, and will appear again in Ex. 32, which we attribute substantially to E. Perhaps in all three passages (Ex. 17:8-16; 24:13-16; 32:17), the Elohist tradition makes use of a tradition-cycle which emphasized the position of Joshua. The Nadab and Abihu of 24:1, 9 are, in this cycle, replaced by the Joshua, Aaron and Hur of 24:13-14.

(d) Exodus 32.--The substance of Ex. 32 has been almost unanimously ascribed to the E stratum since the 19th century, although some scholars have attributed part of the account (especially vv. 7-14) to J.[159] The entire narrative stands as a sequel to the E covenant tradition of 24:1-2, 9-11, 12-15a, 18b, making the identification as E seem most natural.

Further indication of the affinity of Ch. 32 with E is found in vv. 17-18. Here Joshua again has the role of Moses' immediate assistant, as in Ex. 17:8-16 and 24:13. Ascription to E is likewise supported by the use of Elohim (twice in v. 16) and by the statement that it was Moses who brought Israel out of Egypt (v. 7; cf. Ex. 3:10).

---

[159] See Wellhausen, CH, p. 194; Holzinger, *Exodus*, p. 108; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 130-132.

The question arises, however, whether Ex. 32 can be viewed as a unity, for there are many contradictions and unevennesses in the account as it stands. Moses learns in two different ways of events at the foot of the mountain (vv. 7-8; 17-19); twice he intercedes for the people before God (vv. 11-14; 31-33); three different punishments are depicted (vv. 20; 25-29, 35), but at the same time punishment is twice said to be suspended (vv. 14, 34). These and other inconsistencies have often been noted by commentators.[160] What do they indicate about the structure of the story?

The six natural divisions in the narrative are: vv. 1-6; 7-14; 15-20; 20-24; 25-29; 30-34; with v. 35 as a probably secondary concluding note. Of these, the primary account is contained in perfectly coherent form in vv. 1-6, 15-20. Moses, as in the E tradition of Ex. 24:12-15a, 18b, ascends the mountain for a stay of forty days and nights, during which the people, encamped at the foot of the mountain, grow restless. At their urging, Aaron molds a bull to serve as a pedestal of the Deity, a symbol (like the Ark) of Yahweh's presence and leadership.[161]

---

[160] See the summary of Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 130-31 and, more fully, Noth, Exodus, pp. 244-52.

[161] So, initially, H. Th. Obbink, "Jahwebilder," ZAW XLVII (1929), pp. 264-74. This view has been developed and further defined by Albright (FSAC, p. 299) and Eichrodt (Theology of the OT, Vol. I, p. 117). See below, pp. 257ff.

The making of the bull climaxes in a great feast (חג) at which sacrifices are offered on an altar built by Aaron, and the festal cry rings out, "These are your gods, Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt!"[162]

Moses, descending the mountain with the completed covenant tablets, hears the tumult, identified in what appears to be an ancient couplet as "the noise of singing" (v. 18). Angry at this rebellion against his authority, Moses smashes the tablets, symbolizing the breaking of the covenant. He destroys most of the image with fire and casts the remaining particles into water, which the people are forced to drink.

This nucleus is clearly related to the Deuteronomic historian's account of Jeroboam I's institution of bull images at Bethel and his celebration there of a feast (חג) in the eighth month (I Kg. 12). Yet neither narrative is dependent upon the other.[163] They must be seen as independent polemical accounts of the cultic institution of Jeroboam which make use of an old sanctuary legend which once probably legitimized an El cultus at Bethel.

---

[162] Cf. the parallel formulas in I Kg. 12:28 and Neh. 9:18. While the I Kg. 12 formula (הנה אלהיך ... אשר העלוך) does not necessarily indicate a plurality of gods--the plural verb appears with *Elohim* in Gen. 20:13; 35:7; 31:33; Ex. 22:9; Josh. 24:19--the use here of אלה proves beyomd doubt that the E author of Ex. 32 is thinking of Jeroboam's two calves.

[163] Against Noth, ÜP, p. 158, who regards the Ex. 32 account as dependent upon the I Kg. 12 tradition.

In support of this interpretation we note that vv. 1-6 are free of any condemnation of the action of Aaron and the people. The making of the bull symbol is ascribed to Aaron himself; the feast that follows, far from being an act of apostasy, is a חג ליהוה, the God who delivered Israel from Egypt.[164]

Just so, in I Kg. 12 it is only the Deuteronomic historian who represents the bull images as idols. The underlying reason for his condemnation is not that the images themselves are to be worshipped, but that Jeroboam broke the divinely-ordained unity of Israel and spurned the chosen sanctuary of Yahweh at Jerusalem in favor of his own temple. His action, which actually may have represented a restoral of ancient practices (as suggested by the use at Bethel of the old El symbol, the bull[164a]), is thus credited with bringing the wrath of Yahweh upon the Northern Kingdom.[165]

In any case, the nucleus of Ex. 32 and of I Kg. 12 would be the cult legend which validated the bull symbolism, tracing it back to Sinai and to Aaron. It is this very legend which, ironically, E uses to condemn Jeroboam's actions. Upon Moses' descent the image must be utterly destroyed and the feast disrupted; the breaking of the covenant tablets hammers home the lesson. In this way the Elohist tradition unmistakably registers condemnation of Jeroboam's cult, relating it to the primal apostasy of Israel at Sinai.

---

[164] R. Dussaud, Les origines cananéenes du sacrifice israélite (Paris, 1921), p. 244, argues for a basis in an old non-critical tradition. Cf. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," ZAW LXIII (1940/41), pp. 190-215, and the more recent detailed treatment of Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-53.

[164a] F. M. Cross, HTR 55 (1962), pp. 257ff.

[165] J. A. Montgomery, The Books of Kings (ICC), ed. H.S. Gehman (New York: Scribner's, 1951), *ad loc.*

Inserted into this narrative and joined to its conclusion are a number of secondary traditions: vv. 7-14, 21-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35. These supplements aim at excusing Aaron's participation in the making of the calf (vv. 21-24), defending the interests of the Levitical priests (vv. 25-29), and explaining why the apostasy of Israel/Jeroboam was not immediately and visibly punished. V. 35 supplies a fitting punishment which could be intended as a sequel to v. 20.[166] Although these passages were undoubtedly added to the original E narrative of vv. 1-6, 15-20, we cannot attribute them to the early Elohistic tradition, since they lack the typical linguistic and theological motifs of E, and in part contradict the base narrative.

That E engages in a polemic against the cultus of Jeroboam I significantly aligns the E school with the same prophetic or prophetic-Levitical groups which castigate Jeroboam's actions in the traditions preserved in I Kg. 12-13. The basis of the condemnation seems to be: (a) the flouting of the prophetic authority (in Ex. 32 represented by Moses), and (b) the shattering of the divinely-created unity of the people (represented in Ex. 32:15-20 by the sharp contrast between Moses and Joshua on the mountain and the people below in the camp, as well as by the breaking of the covenant tablets). E thus associates itself with early prophetic groups in Israel who held on to the amphictyonic ideal of Israel as a covenant league, and stems, we may suggest, from the period shortly after Solomon's death in which these issues were raised most acutely in Israel.[167]

---

[166] So Noth, ÜP, p. 33, although Noth regards the nucleus of the narrative as Yahwistic.

(e) Exodus 33.--That this chapter falls easily into four quite separate passages has been seen by most commentators. The natural divisions are vv. 1-3a; 3b-6; 7-11; 12-23.[168] The disagreement among scholars concerns the sources of these passages.

Of the older writers, Driver's division is typical:[169]

J = vv. 1, 3-4, 12-23
E = vv. 5a, 5c-6, 7-11
R^{JE} = v. 5b
gloss = v. 2

A similar analysis was recently offered by Beyerlin:[170]

J = vv. 1, 3a, 12-17 (18-23)
E = vv. 3b-4, 5-6, 7-11

---

[167] See below, pp. 253ff.

[168] Cf. Rudolph, Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua, pp. 53-58; Beer, Exodus, pp. 157ff.; Noth, Exodus, pp. 253ff.

[169] Exodus, p. 357f.

[170] Op. cit., p. 32.

Against these typical attempts to see in the chapter the continuation of J and E, Noth has claimed that the whole chapter is simply a collection of unrelated traditions, partly Deuteronomic (vv. 1-6) and partly pre-Deuteronomic (vv. 7-11).[171]

Rudolph calls 33:1-3a "Der Kopf des J-Erzählung vv. 12-17a," and designates 3b-6 and 7-11 as additions related to Ex. 32.[172] Verses 18-23 are described as "eine Art Kommentar zu 34:5f.," . . . "nicht quellenhaft."[173]

Rudolph's observations give a clue to the analysis of the passage. Verses 3b-6, 7-11 are indeed related to Ex. 32, and also to Ex. 24:13; 17:8-16, all of which are Elohistic passages. Verses 3b-6 represent a clear continuation of 32:34, emphasizing again the sin of the people in their apostasy. The Lord will not go directly in their midst, but will accompany them only by means of the Ark.[174]

Yet there is one to whom Yahweh will speak face to face. The immediate presence of God, now denied the people through their own sin, will be available by divine oracle to Moses at the Tent of Meeting (vv. 7-11). The emphasis on Moses as the recipient of revelation is typical of the Elohistic tradition: Moses is the prophet par excellence.

---

[171] Exodus, pp. 253-54.

[172] Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua, pp. 54-55.

[173] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

[174] Ibid., p. 54.

Source analysts, who very commonly attribute vv. 7-11 to E, have pointed also to the mention of Joshua as Moses' minister (משרתו), as well as to the very high status accorded Moses as receiving the direct oracles of God.[175] The passage is clearly related to later E passages in which prophetic activity and the prophetic office of Moses are even more prominent (Num. 11:17, 24-30; 12:4ff.; see below).

(C) The Wilderness Wandering, Num. 10 - Dt. 34

After the great P interpolation, Ex. 35 - Num. 10:28, the epic narrative is taken up again in Num. 10:29. In the remainder of Numbers the P material is easily distinguished, but the epic traditions are often impossible to separate. "The purely linguistic data are indecisive; much turns on interpretation and relation to other passages, the origin of which is also often doubtful."[176]

(1) Num. 11-12

The remark of Gray cited above refers specifically to Chs. 11-12, in which the following passages have often been claimed for E: 11:1-3, 16-17, 24-30; 12:1-15.[177] These passages do not show the use of *Elohim*; they can only be assigned to E on the basis of certain motifs which connect them with other E passages. These characteristic motifs are:

---

[175] So Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 133.

[176] G.B. Gray, Numbers, ICC (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. 103.

(1) The intercession of Moses for the people in 11:1-3, and for Miriam in 12:13. This intercessory prayer is part of E's picture of the prophetic role in Gen. 20:7, 17f., where the same expression (יתפלל) is used. The expression occurs in the Hexateuch only in these two passages and in Num. 21:7.[178]

(2) The depiction of the Tent of Meeting outside the camp (11:16ff., 24f., 26; 12:4) and the theophanic language associated with it (11:17, 25; 12:5) are clearly connected with Ex. 33:7-11. We argued that the latter passage was Elohistic because of its emphasis on Moses as the recipient of revelation, and because of the position of Joshua in 34:11. Identification of the present passage as E, therefore, rests partly on the correctness of our identification of Ex. 33:7-11.

(3) The description of Joshua as Moses' minister (משרת משה) in 11:28.

(4) The position of the seventy elders (11:16f., 24f.),

---

[177] Cf. Carpenter & Harford-Battersby, *op*. *cit*., Vol. I, p. 277; Procksch, *op*. *cit*., p. 98.

[178] Cf. Gray, *op*. *cit*., pp. 99-100.

to which we compare Ex. 18:21-26; 24:1, 9-11.

(5) The depiction of the prophetic activity of the elders and of Eldad and Medad (11:24-30) and, in more general terms, in 12:6. The type of ecstatic behavior described is similar to that attributed to Balaam, Saul, and others, and suggests that the present tradition was preserved in circles allied with early prophecy (cf. also ויחזו את האלהים, Ex. 24:11).

(6) The description of Moses as possessing the prophetic spirit to a unique degree; even a portion of his spirit causes the rest to prophesy. To him God speaks "mouth to mouth," and not in dreams and enigmatic visions (12:7f.).

Thus, while detailed linguistic criteria fail us here, there is every reason to connect Num. 11:1-3, 16-17, 24-30 and the substance of Ch. 12 with E. Only in the E traditions have we seen such an idealization of prophecy (11:29), such heavy use of prophetic terminology, and such an exalted description of Moses as the super-prophet. The associations with the Samuel, Elijah-Elisha and Deuteronomic traditions support ascription to a Northern, prophetically-influenced stream of tradition.

(2) Num. 22-24

Although many scholars have attempted to unravel the JE narratives contained in Num. 13-21, this type of analysis would not contribute to our present task. In fact, the criteria for such division are lacking, there being but one use of Elohim (21:5) and no appearance of characteristic E vocabulary or theological emphasis. No clear evidence of E passages can be found before the Balaam pericope, Num. 22-24.[179]

The many inconsistencies and doublets in the narrative of Num. 22-24[180] have led all of our major commentators to see in these chapters the conflation of two or more sources. The customary division into J and E narratives (here including the poems as well) is reflected in Carpenter and Harford-Battersby:[181]

---

[179] Against Noth (*ÜP*, p. 39), who follows earlier scholars (e.g., Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 221-23) in ascribing the substance of 20:14-18; 21:21-31 to E. The stylistic criteria cited by Gray (*op. cit.*, pp. 264-65) and by Carpenter and Harford-Battersby in support of such identification are inconclusive. Driver (*Introduction*, p. 66) more cautiously designates these passages as "JE."

[180] Accepting the opinion of Albright ("The Oracles of Balaam," JBL LXIII /1944/, pp. 207-233) and of previous commentators (e.g., Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 227), that the poems themselves are of independent origin and were taken up into the epics and furnished with a narrative framework. It is interesting to note, however, that the four poems (23:7-10, 18-24; 24:3-9, 15-19) use *Elohim* as the "A-word" and *Yahweh* or *El-Shadday* as the "B-word"; cf. 23:8, 19, 22, 23; 24:4, 8, 16. Furthermore, "Jacob" is always the A-word and "Israel" the B-word: 23:7, 21, 23; 24:5, 17.

[181] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 224.

E = 22:2-3a, 8-10, 12-16, 19-21, 36b, 38, 40-41; plus all of Ch. 23 except v. 28 (J); vv. 27, 29 (R^{JE});

J = 22:3b-7, 11, 17-18, 22-36a, 39; plus all of Ch. 24.

Gray and Noth give analyses which are quite similar to the foregoing.[182] Even Rudolph, rejecting the theory of two parallel narrative sources, recognizes the following separate strands:[183]

(a) 22:3-21, 36-41; 23:1-26; 24:25--an independent narrative from pre-monarchical times;

(b) 22:22-34--an equally old but separate narrative once longer than in its present form;

(c) 24:3b-9--a separate poem of the time of Saul;

(d) 24:15b-19--a poem from the time of David;

(e) 23:27, 28; 24:1-3a, 10-15a--from the J author of the era of David or Solomon, who also put the above material together, furnishing these verses in order to connect the various strands.

Even though the inconsistencies of the narrative of Num. 22-24 are accompanied by the use of Yahweh in some passages and Elohim in others, the usage appears to be so in-consistent that it cannot be used to distinguish sources.[184] Rudolph has tried to detect, for example, an underlying system in which, say, Elohim was used by the narrator himself, Yahweh being used only in the speeches of Balaam and Balak. But Rudolph is only able to apply this scheme by juggling the very confused textual evidence of the various versions.[185] He finally comes to the rather weak conclusion that ". . . dieser (i.e., the Yahwist) sagt in der Erzählung, wenn kein besonderer Fall vorliegt Yahweh, und legt Ausländern bald Elohim, bald Yahweh in den Mund."[186]

---

[182] Gray, op. cit., p. 313; Noth, ÜP, pp. 34-35, 39.

[183] Op. cit., pp. 127-28; see Eissfeldt's summary, "Die Komposition der Bileam-Erzählung," ZAW LVII (1939), pp. 218-20.

Eissfeldt analyzes the relation of the usage of the divine names to the narrative strands which he distinguishes and concludes, "Ein System im Gebrauch der Gottesnamen ist weder in der einen noch in der anderen Erzählung erkennbar."[187]

The reason for the breakdown of regular usage here is undoubtedly theological. Countless scribes and story-tellers must have puzzled over the tale of a foreign seer who acted as Yahweh's prophet. Would such a stranger use Yahweh's personal name? Would he not rather speak of Elohim? But if he were a prophet of Yahweh, must he not validate his office by speaking explicitly in the name of Yahweh? These questions and their attempted answers have hopelessly confused the use of Yahweh and Elohim in the Masoretic text and in the versions.

---

[184] So Albright, op. cit., p. 207.

[185] Op. cit., pp. 104-106. Cf. Eissfeldt's critique of Rudolph's method, op. cit., pp. 213-215.

[186] Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 105-107.

[187] Op. cit., p. 232.

In spite of the confusion in the use of Yahweh and Elohim, a strand of narrative can be identified which is transparently E. The basis of the identification is the familiar theme of prophetic revelation in a night dream or vision.

The narrative strand in which this theme appears is found first in 22:3-21, 36-40. God (Elohim) comes to Balaam in the night and instructs him. What Elohim tells Balaam to do he must do: "Though Balak were to give me his house full of silver and gold, I could not go beyond the command of the Lord my God, to do less or more" (22:18b; cf. 22:8-9, 19-20). These passages form an interesting contrast to the inserted narrative about Balaam's encounter with the angel of Yahweh (22:21-35). In the latter story the obedience of Balaam to Yahweh is brought about through a highly amusing conversation between Balaam and his ass. The Elohistic story in 22:3-21, 36-41 is much less earthy and more reflective, showing a radical concern for the nature of prophetic obedience and for the certainty of the divine revelation. "Have I any power at all to speak anything? The word that God puts in my mouth, that must I speak" (22:38). We are reminded of Joseph's question, "Do not interpretations belong to God?," and of the obedient response of the boy Samuel, "Speak, for your servant is listening" (I Sam. 3:10).

Is the Elohistic narrative here discussed a unity? Most commentators have treated the whole of Ch. 22 as a conflation of J and E, finding J not only in the inserted pericope of vv. 22-35, but in other verses throughout the chapter.[188] It appears to the present writer that this analysis has been mistaken. We must instead regard the chapter as composed of two main blocks of material, vv. 2-21, 36-40 on the one hand, and vv. 22-35 on the other. The inconsistencies of the E narrative of vv. 2-21, 36-40 should not be ascribed to the insertion of fragments from a parallel J account, but to the growth of the narrative in the course of transmission in E circles. For example, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby and even Noth regard v. 3 as a conflation of two sources. Might it not rather be the remnant of an underlying verse narrative, with *parallelismus membrorum*? If we omit כי רב הוא in the middle of verse 3 as an explanatory gloss, the remaining words scan 4 + 4, with exactly eleven syllables in each side of the bicolon:

---

[188] Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 313, attributes vv. 6, 7, 11, 17f., 22-35, 37, to J. Similarly, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 277.

ויגר מואב מפני העם מאד   ויקץ מואב מפני בני ישראל.

The other inconsistencies, such as the varied designations of Balaam's visitors (vv. 5, 7, 8, 14, 15, 18, 21), should perhaps be described as the variants which have grown up within one E narrative tradition.[189]

Similarly, 22:41-23:26 can be treated as a unified narrative, probably Elohistic, which parallels 23:27-24:25, generally assumed to be J. 23:27 forms the transitional verse which makes the parallel narratives appear to be consecutive. The unity of 22:41-23:26, and its connection with the Elohistic material of Ch. 22, is shown by the almost verbatim recurrence of the formula which introduces prophetic speech:

22:38 הדבר אשר ישים אלהים בפי
23:5 וישם יהוה דבר בפי בלעם
23:12 את אשר ישים יהוה בפיו
23:16 וישם דבר בפיו

This formula, or any equivalent formula, is lacking in Ch. 24. Ch. 23 is also tied together and related to the Elohistic narrative in Ch. 22, by the recurrence of the in the successive scenes (vv. 6, 17; cf. 22 13, 15, 21).

---

[189] Cf. Rudolph's treatment of the chapter, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-119.

To summarize, the E tradition appears to be preserved in 22:2-21, 36-40; 22:41 - 23:27. Its theological importance is the strong stress which is laid on prophetic matters, above all on the necessity of utter obedience to the revelation in which the prophet is called. The customary E formula for the prophetic call is lacking, perhaps in recognition of the fact that Balaam is not of the people of Israel. Balaam nevertheless truly functions as a prophet through whom God reveals his purpose for Israel in history.[190]

(3) Num. 25; 32

The precise sources of the remaining chapters in Numbers and of the narrative material in Dt. 31; 34 are, with the exception of P, impossible to determine with absolute certainty. Both the P editing process and the addition of the Deuteronomic History have brought about such displacements and omissions that we can no longer be certain where or how the epic narratives reached their conclusion. This, at any rate, is the opinion of the writer.[191] Nevertheless, since it has been very commonly held that the epic sources continue to appear in Num. 25; 32; Dt. 31-34, we must examine the evidence in some detail.

---

[190] Compare Abimelech in Gen. 20, with whom the regular Elohistic formula is not used either.

[191] In agreement with Noth, ÜP, p. 35, nn. 126, 127; p. 39, n. 142. Noth's earlier treatment, in ÜSt, pp. 27-28, 39-40, postulated the use of the old epic sources in Dt. 1-4, 31-34, though he maintained that we cannot distinguish the sources in detail.

The Baal Peor narrative in Num. 25:1-5 has usually been attributed to JE and, on the basis of apparent doublets in these few verses, scholars have gone on to distinguish traces of separate J and E accounts. Thus, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby separate vv. 1a, 3a, 5, from vv. 2, 3b, 4, and conclude, "The close correspondence of v. 2 with Ex. 34:15 makes it certain that this account is derived from J; the reference to the judges (v. 5) confirms the belief that the other elements must be drawn from E" (cf. Ex. 18:21).[192]

Now it may be true that the tradition of 25:1-5 distinguishes itself sharply from the remainder of the chapter. In vv. 6ff., the people with whom Israel falls into apostasy are not Moabites, as in v. 1, but Midianites, and Yahweh's sentence is executed not by judges, as in v. 5, but by a priest. Thus, the P tradition, responsible for the rest of the chapter, is clearly set off from vv. 1-5. It is furthermore quite probable that vv. 1-5 are the remains of an ancient tradition of Israel's early apostasy, and may very well come from J.[193]

---

[192] _Op. cit._, Vol. II, p. 229; similarly, Gray, _op. cit._, pp. 380-83.

At the same time, there is little basis for the division of 25:1-5 into two parallel accounts, and certainly none for the ascription of a few scraps of this narrative to E. There is no necessary contradiction, for example, between Israel's "yoking himself to the Baal of Peor" (v. 3) and Israel's "worshiping their gods" (v. 2). Surely the Moabites could worship both Chemosh, their national deity, and also various manifestations of the Canaanite Baal.[194] Verses 4-5 could, moreover, be read in sequence, so that (a) Moses immediately executes chiefs of the people to avert the divine fury; (b) gives orders to his officials (שפטי ישראל) to dispatch any individuals who had directly participated in the pagan sacrifices. In any case, the narrative as we have it is a mere torso; this prevents us from drawing definite conclusions about its history.[195]

In Num. 32 there is even less readiness to assign specific verses to J and E, even among scholars who ordinarily display little restraint in such matters. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby refuse to assign any part of the chapter to E, though they propose that vv. 39-42 might be J, assigning the rest to P.[196] According to Gray, "A strict analysis of the chapter as between JE and P cannot be satisfactorily carried through."[197] Procksch assigns a few fragments to E (v. 1a, except the words עצום מאד ; v. 3, vv. 16-17, 20b, 34-38, 40) on the slender basis of a hypothetical reconstruction of the Elohistic account of the Conquest.[198] But there is simply no evidence for such a reconstruction, and all stylistic and theological characteristics of E are lacking. We must conclude with Noth,[199]

---

[193] So Rudolph, *op. cit.*, p. 128, who argues, "Während der letzte Lagerort der Israeliten bei J auf der moabitischen Hochebene gelegen war (21:20; 23:(14), 28), sind sie mit 25:1 (Sittîm) in die Jordansenke gelangt, die bei P schon in 22:1 erreicht war. 25:1 führt also die vorausgehende geographische J-Situation weiter und erweist sich damit als die Fortsetzung in J."

[194] With Rudolph, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-29. Rudolph argues in addition that אלהיהן in v. 2 means "their god."

[195] Cf. John Marsh, "Numbers," IB, Vol. II, p. 263.

> Die Landnahmedarstellung auch von E innerhalb des alten Pentateuchgutes ist mit Rücksicht auf P verlorengegangen. Selbst in Num. 32 sind E-Elemente nicht mehr nachweisbar.

(4) Deuteronomy 31-34

First of all we exclude from consideration the two poems which, with their prose introductions, comprise Dt. 32-33. It has been common to regard one or both of these poems as coming from the E tradition, but in fact there is no basis for this in either language or theology.[200] The poems, as has now been well demonstrated, are both extremely ancient and have their own independent history of transmission.[201] Most probably they were drawn into the final edition of Deuteronomy as part of the series of appendices which comprise chapters 31-34.[202]

---

[196] *Op*. *cit*., Vol. II, pp. 239-41.

[197] *Op*. *cit*., p. 426.

[198] *Op*. *cit*., p. 119; *cf*. pp. 111-112.

[199] ÜP, p. 39, n. 142.

In Dt. 31 a series of dislocations in the text suggests that a writer put together narrative parts written on separate scraps, without much regard to their order.[203] Verses 14-15, 23 stand out especially as being not only out of place, but contradictory to the rest of the chapter. Apart from these verses the chapter has four sections: (a) an address of Moses giving a final charge to Israel (vv. 1-6); (b) Moses' final charge to Joshua, vv. 7-8; (c) Moses writes the law and gives instructions for its public reading in the future (vv. 9-13); (d) an introduction to the Song of Moses (Dt. 32) in two parts (vv. 16-22, 24-30), which predict the apostasy and punishment of Israel alluded to in the Song.[204]

---

[200] For example, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 278) ascribe Ch. 33 to E, but designate Ch. 32 as an addition to D. Eissfeldt (*Einleitung*, pp. 271-74) attributes Ch. 32 to E, but describes Ch. 33 as an ancient poem which is "nicht quellenhaft." Procksch (*op. cit.*, pp. 120-27) relates Ch. 33 to E, but attributes Ch. 32 to a Deuteronomic source. Among recent writers, Weiser (*Introduction*, pp. 117-119) still argues that both Chs. 32 and 33 were transmitted within the E tradition.

[201] On Dt. 32, see especially G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 26-67, with bibliography cited there. On Dt. 33, see F. M. Cross, Jr., and David N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," JBL LXVII (1948), pp. 191-210.

[202] So G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, Vol. II, pp. 315, 511-537.

[203] *Ibid.*, p. 516.

In the midst of the above material, which clearly comes from the hands of Deuteronomic editors, vv. 14-15, 23 tell of Moses and Joshua at the Tent of Meeting, where Joshua receives the divine commission as Moses' successor. These verses have been attributed to E, as Carpenter and Harford-Battersby argue, on the following grounds: (a) the prominence ascribed to Joshua (cf. Ex. 17:8-16; 24:13; 32:17; 33:11); (b) the reference to the Tent of Meeting (cf. Ex. 33:7-11; Num. 12:4-10); (c) the theophany of Yahweh in the pillar of cloud at the Tent (cf. Ex. 33:9; Num. 12:5); and (d) the promise of Yahweh to be with Joshua as he was with Moses (cf. Ex. 3:12).[205]

Clearly, conclusions must rest on the analysis of the earlier passages cited as parallels, especially Ex. 33:7-11 and Num. 12:4ff., since the verses in question must come from the same stream of tradition.[206] We argued previously that Ex. 33:7-11 and Num. 12 were E, primarily on the basis of the position of Moses as the recipient of revelation and, in the case of Num. 12, because of the obvious prophetic interests of the narrator. In addition, the figure of Joshua as Moses' "minister" (משרת) connects the Tent of Meeting passages (including the present one) with a series of other passages ascribed to the E tradition in which Joshua has this role.

---

[204] Cf. Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. 333-44.

[205] Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 295.

[206] So Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 159f., who designates all these passages as "J supplements."

Consequently we believe that the arguments for attributing Dt. 31:14-15, 23, in their origin, to the E tradition are strong, but we recognize that the argument depends on the identification of a number of other passages.

Dt. 34 appears to depend, as scholars have long noted, on the final P edition of the older historical source~~s~~, and also shows Deuteronomic or deuteronomistic editing.[207] Verses 1-4 or 1-6 are commonly attributed to J, vv. 7-9 to P (cf. Num. 27:18ff.), and vv. 10-12 to E, or to a deuteronomistic editing of and E fragment.[208] It is true that vv. 10-12 reflect the same stream of tradition which is visible in Ex. 33:7-11; Num. 12; Dt. 31:14-15, which we have just argued is to be identified with the E tradition. We note in the present passage, as typical of the E strand, the express designation of Moses as a prophet receiving the direct revelation of the Deity. Accordingly, we are inclined to attribute the present passage to E.

---

[207] Wellhausen, CH, pp. 115-116; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 301. The latter call Ch. 34 "an amalgam of all the chief documents of the Hexateuch." Cf. Procksch, op. cit., pp. 127f.; Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 162ff.

[208] Cf. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 164, who comments, "Bei v. 10-12 erinnert v. 10 stark an Ex. 33:11, Num. 12:8, so dass man an dieselbe Hand wie dort denken könnte." Wright ("Deuteronomy," IB, Vol. II, p. 511) regards the editor as the author of the Deuteronomic History, as in Noth's theory.

Admittedly, however, a Deuteronomic editor--perhaps the writer of the Deuteronomic History--has worked over these verses, drawing the fragments of tradition into his own framework and style. Since the Deuteronomic school is rather closely related to the E school, we cannot in the end be certain whether he drew the tradition directly from the E epic, or whether he drew independently upon a common stock of Northern E-D traditions.

(D) The Conquest, Josh. 1-24

The now widely accepted thesis of Martin Noth that the books Deuteronomy through II Kings comprise a single historical work has forced a radical change in scholars' understanding of the Book of Joshua.[209] Whereas it was once almost universally agreed that Joshua represented a continuation of the Pentateuchal sources--hence the widespread use of the term "Hexateuch"--it has now become questionable whether we can speak of these sources at all in the Deuteronomic account of the Conquest. Instead, it appears that the JE account of the Conquest of Palestine has been replaced, save perhaps for a fragmentary account of the Trans-Jordanian stage of the process (Num. 25;32), by the account of the Deuteronomic historian. And in fact, despite the opinions of outstanding scholars to the contrary, we cannot be at all sure that the epic traditions ever contained an account of the Conquest.[210]

---

[209] Noth, ÜSt, pp. 3-110; Das Buch Josua, HAT (2d. ed., Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), pp. 7-16.

Noth's theory, in broad terms, is that the historian responsible for the collection and editing of Deuteronomy - II Kings, living during the Exile, used the 7th-century Deuteronomic Code as the theological foundation for his work. He set this older corpus at the beginning as a sort of programmatic preface, providing it and the work as a whole with an introduction (Dt. 1:1-4:43).[211] Fragments of older narratives, probably coming from JE, were added at the end to complete the story of Moses' life (Dt. 31; 34), and two ancient poems (Dt. 32; 33) were inserted as fitting conclusions to Moses' farewell address.[212]

---

[210] John Bright has argued that the epic traditions must have concluded with an account of the Conquest, in his "Joshua," IB, Vol. II, p. 544.

[211] Josua, pp. 7-16. Cf. Bright's excellent summary of Noth's position, op. cit., pp. 541-42.

[212] Noth, ÜSt, pp. 39-40, 211-216.

The Book of Joshua was built up, Noth believes, out of a mass of ancient narrative and annalistic materials, including a series of etiological tales which form the bulk of Chs. 2-11 and had already existed as a distinct collection by the 9th century.[213] These tales were made into a history of the Conquest by the historian, and provided with an introduction in Ch. 1 and a conclusion in 11:21-12:24. The boundary and city lists of Chs. 13-22, and the covenant ceremony tradition of Ch. 24, formed no part of the original Deuteronomic work which, in Noth's view, ended with the farewell address of Joshua in Ch. 23.[214]

Three scholars may be mentioned who, with varying emphases, maintain that the sources of Chs. 1-12 are the same as the sources of the Pentateuch: Otto Eissfeldt, Artur Weiser, and John Bright. Eissfeldt continues to insist that the Pentateuchal sources, including his "L-source," are to be traced through Joshua, and even through Judges and I-II Samuel.[215] For Weiser, the narrative base of Josh. 1-12; 24 is the E strand, though this has been edited and supplemented by a Deuteronomic reviser, whose work is clearly evident, for example, in 1:10ff. J, on the other hand, appears only in short passages which do not determine the character of the work as a whole, which is thus basically E.[216] Bright, heavily indebted as he admittedly is to Noth in his analysis of Joshua, maintains that the JE epic is the source from which the Deuteronomic historian drew the account of the Conquest in Chs. 2-11, and that Ch. 1 contains traces of this ancient source (vv. 1-2, 10-11).[217] Bright states clearly the arguments which are typical of those scholars who trace the Pentateuchal epic narratives into Joshua:

---

[213] _Josua_, pp. 20-21. Noth acknowledges the earlier studies to which he is indebted in this matter, especially Alt's "Josua," _Werden und Wesen des A.T._, pp. 13-29.

[214] _Josua_, pp. 11-16.

[215] _Einleitung_, pp. 290-308.

> (i) The major emphasis of J since Gen. 12, and of E since Gen. 15, has been that Israel would one day inherit the Promised Land (cf. Gen. 12:1-3, 7; 13:14-17; 15:7, 13-16 and passim throughout Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers). Without an account of the way in which this actually came to pass the narratives of J and E would be a torso. Either chs. 1-11 give that story or it has been lost--an unlikely supposition in view of the fact that the rest of JE is preserved. (ii) Num. 32:1-17, 20-27, 34-42 (JE) tell how the Trans-Jordan tribes received their heritage. Is it not likely that JE would also inform us how the other tribes fared? (iii) Finally, in Num. 25:1-5 we find Israel encamped at Shittim, where the JE document of the Pentateuch leaves them. It is precisely at Shittim that 2:1 takes up the story. For these reasons we must regard the older narratives of chs. 1-11 as JE.[218]

---

[216] Introduction, pp. 143-47.

[217] Op. cit., pp. 543-45.

[218] Ibid., p. 544.

With regard to the first point made by Bright, we quote the remark of another recent scholar: "The argument from the promise of the land cannot stand apart from the demonstration of literary contacts. The only literary contact on which everyone agrees is with Deuteronomy and the rest of the Deuteronomic history . . . "[219] We cannot maintain that the source of Chs. 1-12 (or 2-11) is JE unless we can show definite points of stylistic and theological contact with J and E in individual narratives.

Secondly, in answer to points (ii) and (iii) above, we may say that certain aspects of the Joshua account complement and continue, geographically and temporally, the epic traditions in Numbers (though we have seen how uncertain is the analysis of the Num. 25 and 32 passages upon which Bright depends). But this does not demonstrate that the Joshua narratives are from the same epic traditions which we have traced through Genesis, for they might come from an independent account of the Conquest circulating separately from the epic tradition.

Hence we must examine the concrete evidence for the relation of the Joshua narratives in Chs. 1-11 and 24 to E, and specifically--since that is our interest--to E. Doublets and inconsistencies in the narratives will not serve as proof unless they are accompanied by some of the constants in the E tradition.[220]

---

[219] E.M. Good, "Book of Joshua," IDB, Vol. II, p. 990.

The main features which are appealed to in Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's work as signs of E in Joshua are: "Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' minister" (1:1) and "Joshua the son of Nun" (2:1; 6:6; 24:29); "according to the number of the tribes of the children of Israel" in 4:5, reminiscent of the covenant ceremony in Ex. 24:4; Joshua's elevation of a spear during the conquest of Ai in 8:18, 26, which is compared to Moses' use of the rod in Ex. 17:8ff.; "Amorites" in 10:5-6; 24:8; "Elohim" in 24:1; "the hornet" in 24:12 (cf. Ex. 23:28); "forgive" (ישא) in 24:19 (cf. Gen. 50:17; Ex. 23:21; 34:7 [J]); "set them a statute and an ordinance" in 24:25 (cf. Ex. 15:25); the stone as witness in 24:27 (cf. Gen. 21:30); the burial of Joseph's bones (24:32; cf. Gen. 50:25).[221]

This list of parallels with the language and content of the E tradition in the Pentateuch is not only scanty, it is riddled with uncertainties. "Joshua the son of Nun" appears elsewhere in the Deuteronomic history in Dt. 1:38 and Jg. 2:8, apart from the previously discussed occurrences in

---

[220] See the discussion of doublets and inconsistencies in Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, _op_. _cit_., Vol. II, pp. 304-306. There are doublets and other signs of composition in Joshua, but these only demonstrate variation between ancient traditions on which the Deuteronomic historian drew, not the presence of J and E.

[221] _Op_. _cit_., Vol. II, pp. 309, 320-59.

Dt. 31 and 34, and is reflected in I Chr. 7:27. Hence it is a feature of the E language, we might theorize, which has been picked up by the Deuteronomic school. Joshua's elevation of the spear during the battle for Ai may be a deliberate attempt to show him in the place of Moses, but this does not prove that the E circle contributed the passage. It shows only that the Deuteronomic historian wishes to cast Joshua in the role of Moses' divinely-sanctioned successor, as is clear in Dt. 3:28. The use of the word "Amorites" for the original inhabitants of Canaan can only doubtfully be ascribed to E in the Pentateuch (so Noth), and is otherwise a known feature of Deuteronomic style. *Elohim* in 24:1 occurs in a set phrase, "before God" (לפני האלהים) which refers to a cultic setting and does not show that the tradition involved here customarily uses *Elohim*; on the contrary, *Yahweh* is used in the rest of the chapter. The remainder of the E features cited depend on passages which are not actually E (such as the Covenant Code), or on passages which we cannot ascribe with any certainty to E. The argument from language and content thus breaks down.

The argument from the presence of Elohistic theological motifs in Joshua is best stated by Artur Weiser:

> The E strand plays the main role dominating the picture of the conquest of the land. Yahweh's miracles at the crossing of the Jordan in 3:5ff. and at the capture of Jericho in [Ch.] 6, the claim in 24:23 for Yahweh alone to be worshipped, which is the practical deduction from the story of the conquest which God has directed, all reveal

the Elohist's tendency to lead up to exhortation, which can be observed elsewhere in E.[222]

Admittedly, the tendency toward a didactic presentation of history is present in the E tradition of the Pentateuch. But it is no argument for the assigning of passages in Joshua to E because (a) these passages must still be shown, through language and manner of presentation, to be closely similar to E; and (b) the hortatory shaping of historical traditions is precisely what we find also in the Deuteronomic school. Thus it is _a priori_ unlikely that we should be able to separate the similar hortatory emphases of the Elohistic and the Deuteronomic traditions, especially in a book which is admittedly very heavily edited by the Deuteronomic school. Weiser himself, speaking of Deuteronomy, remarks, "The Elohist tradition with its fight against strange gods and heathen customs and with its hortatory view of history is carried on /in Deuteronomy/ . . . "[223] And in discussing the Deuteronomic version of Joshua Weiser writes, "The Deuteronomic revision, the form in which we now have the Elohist tradition of Joshua, agrees with the picture given by E of the conquest of the land as a whole. . . .The tradition derived from E of the conquest of the land as a whole and the extermination of its inhabitants means for the theological outlook on history of the Deuteronomist the abolition of the danger of syncretism."[224]

---

[222] _Introduction_, p. 145. [223] _Ibid._, p. 132.

We conclude that if the Deuteronomist's picture of the conquest is in agreement with that of "the E tradition," and if it is not certain how the two traditions are to be distinguished in their hortatory emphases, and if in addition there are no really unequivocal marks of E language and style, then we are in no position to claim E as a basis for the work of the Deuteronomic historian in Joshua. The most that the above scholars have been able to demonstrate is the very close relationship between the E school and the school of Deuteronomy (see below, Ch. V).

(E) The Primeval History, Gen. 1-11

As the concluding part of our treatment of the content and scope of E, we must consider the possibility that there are remnants of E traditions in Gen. 1-11. Here we will be directly addressing issues raised by Sigmund Mowinckel in his monograph, The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11.[225] Mowinckel is the only leading scholar in recent times to affirm the presence of parallel J and E narratives in the primeval history; it has otherwise been almost universally held that E began with the Abraham narratives.

---

[224] Ibid., p. 146.

[225] Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1937.

2

Mowinckel's argument moves in four stages, each of which must be discussed separately:

(1) He first separates, through intricate literary analysis, two separate but parallel strands in the non-Priestly matter of Gen. 1-11.[226]

(2) He then attempts a relative dating of the two strands, finding his strand "A" to be the older, and strand "B" not only later, but dependent upon the first one.[227]

(3) The next step is to identify the earlier strand A with the J epic, strand B with E.[228]

(4) Finally, Mowinckel supports both his relative and his absolute dating of the two strands by a consideration of the "Babylonian matter" in the Primeval History, which he finds limited to the later E source. He deduces that this Babylonian material came into Israel in the last period of the monarchy, hence after the composition of J, but before and during the period of E's composition.[229]

---

[226] Op. cit., pp. 7-43.

[227] Ibid., pp. 44-50

[228] Ibid., pp. 50-72.

[229] Ibid., pp. 72-84. Mowinckel follows Hölscher in tracing E through the Deuteronomic history, and dates its composition after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. (Ibid., p. 78, n. 1).

Even a hasty analysis of Mowinckel's arguments reveals grave flaws. With regard to the first point, to be sure, he is on fairly solid ground, even though his literary analysis is not convincing in detail. That is, Mowinckel is perfectly correct in asserting that the non-Priestly materials of the Primeval History do not form a unity, but a collection of traditions which do not agree in their presentation. The many inconsistencies, doublets, and shifts in terminology long ago led Wellhausen to postulate a long oral and written development of the Primeval History, through a series of additions and supplements to an original kernel, which he identified as Chs. 2; 3; 4:16-24; 11:1-9. He concluded,

> Das Einzelne lässt sich nicht ausmachen, aber die Hauptsache steht fast: es hat nicht bloss ein Zusammenarbeiten grosser Zusammenhänge stattgefunden, sondern in diese Zusammenhänge, sei es vor, oder mit, oder nach ihrer Vereinigung, sind vielfach kleiner unselbständige Stücke aufgenommen worden, teils mehr gelehrten und theoretischen, teils auch volkstümlichen Ursprungs. Denn die mündliche Überlieferung, nachdem sie einmal auf Schrift gebracht war, stand doch nicht plötzlich still, sondern entwickelte sich, nunmehr in Wechselwirkung mit der Schrift, noch weiter und nahm auch ganz neue Stoffe von aussen auf, die dann demnächst wiederum literarisch fixiert wurden.[230]

Wellhausen's observations (which express the older literary-critical theory with more subtlety than is usually credited to the Wellhausenists) were followed by by Karl Budde and Hermann Gunkel, with one important new development: Budde and Gunkel found two parallel collections of ancient traditions lying behind the "J" primeval history. Gunkel defined their contents in detail in his Genesis commentary, and called them "J^e" and "J^j" in the belief that the awkward Yahweh-Elohim of Gen. 2:4b-3:24 pointed to a combination of sources which used, respectively, these two divine names.[231] Eissfeldt's "L-source" and Pfeiffer's "S-source" represent other attempts to deal with the Primeval History by this type of literary analysis.

---

[230] CH, pp. 15-16.

There can be no question, then, that Mowinckel was correct in calling our attention to the composite nature of the J primeval history, and in this he is in the company of leading scholars. But two parallel narratives can only be derived from the account by a scissors-and-paste type of literary criticism which we must repudiate. Many of the "doublets" and "contradictions" which Mowinckel points to in Gen. 2:4b-3:24, for example, are in contexts of poetic parallelism and cannot be used to prove two different sources. Thus, he lists "3:18a parallel in substance to 3:19b; the first speaks of 'adamah and the second of ʿaphar; cf. the same parallel in 2:7."[232] But surely this passage simply reflects a common kind of poetic parallelism in

---

[231] Genesis, pp. 1-140; see especially the summary on pp. 1-3.

[232] Op. cit., p. 9.

Hebrew literature, not an "*'adamah* source" and an "*ʿaphar* source!"

Furthermore, Mowinckel extends his method past the point of credibility by creating parallels where there are none in the material as it stands. For example, to cite an instance of the creation of parallels in two directions, we quote a passage from the discussion of the Cain and Abel story, Gen. 4.

> Precisely on account of the kinship in spirit and motif which according to all the evidence must have existed between the older Ḳain-Abel narrative and the Romulus-Remus legend, it would be very natural, not to say necessary, to combine the narrative of 4:2-16 with the notice regarding the building of the city in 4:17b, and to infer that it was about this work--perhaps when offering sacrifices at the laying of the foundation stone--that Ḳain quarrelled with his brother and killed him. Afterwards Ḳain completed the building of the town alone, and called it after his son Ḥanok.
>
> *The A-strand must actually have contained, at one time, some such story as this.*
>
> It has long been felt that there is a lacuna between 4:1 and 4:17, which is not properly filled up with 4:2-16 . . . Evidence that the strand is broken off at 4:1 is afforded also by the incomplete text in 4:1b. The Ḳain-Abel narrative of the A-strand originally followed 4:1. The notice in 4:17b is a displaced fragment of this narrative.[233]

In discussing the sequence of events in the "B" (E) narrative strand, Mowinckel states:

> The immediate continuation of the paradise narrative in E, as in J, was the statement that the man came together with his wife, so that she conceived and gave birth to Seth, the first man born on the earth (*4:25). And then followed, in the form of a genealogy with anecdotal

---

[233] *Ibid*., p. 42 (emphasis in original).

> notices and stories inserted in it, the list of the first patriarchs on the earth, father and son for ten generations from "the Man" Adam to Noaḥ. Of this list only the fragments 4:25*, 26; 5:28b *, 29 have come down to us. But no doubt it was identical with P's Sethite list Ch. 5, both as regards the names and arrangement generally.[234]

Thus, parallels are inferred from "A" to "B" and from "B" to "A," and also from P to "A" and "B." But in fact we do not have two parallel narrative strands, but a *collection of traditions* about primeval times which the Yahwist uses for his own theological and literary purposes. In speaking of the work of the Yahwist, Noth comments:

> Für die grundlegende Schöpfungs- und Sündenfallgeschichte (Gen. 2 und 3) . . . , die als zusammenhängende Einheit gestaltet ist, ist er anscheinend keiner der zahlreichen altorientalischen Schöpfungsüberlieferungen gefolgt, sondern hat für das von ihm zu Sagende nur allerlei Einzelerzählungselemente wie den von Gott gepflanzten Garten in Gestalt einer Oase in der Wüste und andrerseits in Gestalt eines Paradieses auf dem Weltberg im Norden . . . zu einer grossen Komposition zusammengearbeitet, deren wesentliche Substanz jedoch nicht in diesen zusammengearbeiteten Elementen, sondern in dem zentralen eigenen Beitrag von J liegt.[235]

With regard to Mowinckel's third point, that his "B-strand" is to be identified with the Elohist tradition, we must again demur. In answer we simply quote Mowinckel's own words:

---

[234] *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69 (the * indicates that only part of the verse is attributed to the source named).

[235] ÜP, pp. 257-58.

> The arguments from linguistic statistics are too few to afford any reliable answer here, especially as the clue furnished by the divine names Yahwe and Elohim is here to some extent absent, Nor, in material of this nature, dealing with the Creation and Primeval History, where one would expect the traditions to have attained a high degree of fixity on account of the sacredness of the subject-matter, is it probable that the compiler's religious and theological ideas have reshaped the matter to such an extent that they can serve as literary-critical arguments.[236]

In short, there are none of the linguistic criteria or theological motifs which we have been relying on for our identification of E passages. With these absent, discussion about the presence of E becomes so subjective and lacking in any effective controls as to be meaningless.

The fourth step in Mowinckel's argument, that the chief difference between the "J" and "E" primeval histories is in the presence of "Babylonian matter" in E, has been heavily criticized by W. F. Albright in a review and subsequently in an article. Albright states quite correctly that the J author must have drawn on very ancient and widespread stories and myths which were current in the Fertile Crescent by the early second millennium B.C. The cultural source of these early traditions was North Mesopotamia, rather than either Canaan or exilic Babylonia:

> . . . It is in the region between the Euphrates and the Khabur that we should look for the direct antecedents of the Hebrew people and of most of the early stories of Genesis. Babylonia had, indeed, contributed greatly,

---

[236] *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

> but this contribution reached Israel through the Amorites and Proto-Arameans of the Upper Euphrates region. There is nothing in the data now available to forbid my view that most of the matter in the stories of creation, of paradise, and of the antediluvian patriarchs, of the Flood, and of the Tower of Babel reached Palestine with the Hebrews before the middle of the second millennium B.C.[237]

Certainly nothing has turned up since 1938 to overthrow Albright's theory, but in fact it has received further support.[238] In any case we cannot use a theory about the date of the entrance of prevalent ancient material into Israelite literature to support literary-critical and traditio-historical reconstructions. The literary analysis of the Primeval History and the dating of the J and E epic traditions must stand on their own feet.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have shown that there is a fairly homogeneous body of traditions, scattered from Genesis through Numbers, which is distinguished from other Pentateuchal traditions by certain features, both stylistic and theological. The most dependable stylistic features are the use of *Elohim* and a form of dialogue which occurs in scenes in which God reveals himself to a prophetic figure.

---

[237] Albright, in his review of Mowinckel's book, JBL LVII, p. 103. Mowinckel and Albright later exchanged views in "The Babylonian Matter in the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11," JBL LVIII (1939), pp. 87-103.

[238] Cf. G. Mendenhall, "Biblical History in Transition," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, pp. 38-40.

Closely associated with this latter feature are the major theological emphases of this E tradition: the interest in prophecy and in prophetic problems of divine revelation; stress on the human response of fear and awe toward God; obedience to the divine command as revealed to prophets; reflection on moral problems of sin, guilt and forgiveness, and a general sensitivity to moral issues; a thoroughly religious understanding of history.

We now turn to the task of establishing the probable provenance and date of the Elohist tradition and to a consideration of its relation to other streams of tradition in ancient Israelite religion and literature.

CHAPTER IV

THE E TRADITION AND EARLY NORTHERN PROPHECY

Having characterized the E tradition in the Pentateuch and delimited its scope, our next task is to ascertain the date and provenance of this tradition. In accordance with the methodology discussed in Chapter II, we will not argue in terms of isolated geographical and historical references and minute matters of style and diction. Instead we shall examine the history of the traditions with which E has the closest affinities, and then attempt to determine the relative date of E as compared with these other Old Testament traditions. This will lead us into a discussion of the Samuel and Elijah traditions and then, in the next chapter, of Hosea and Deuteronomy.

(I) The Prophetic Traditions Concerning Samuel

Before we are able to discuss the affinities of the E tradition with the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel we must establish a critical basis by discussing these Samuel traditions in themselves. The most influential efforts to resolve the problems presented by them must be evaluated.

(A) History of Criticism

Since the beginning of modern Old Testament criticism scholars have recognized that the books of Samuel are composite.[1] Most commonly, the critics have resorted to a literary analysis which breaks the present narrative down into its original components, which are regarded as fragments of originally separate and continuous sources. In this type of analysis, two main sources have been recognized.[2]

Not only has the methodology thus employed been very similar to that used in Pentateuchal studies, the results of Pentateuchal criticism are often drawn upon in dealing with the Samuel traditions. As a result, some influential scholars have held that the two main sources are actually identical with J and E.[3] While we do not hold with this solution in detail, we believe that the Samuel traditions which have been identified as E do have close affinities with E, and may have been produced by a Northern prophetic-levitical school associated with the E school.

---

[1] The composition of the Books of Samuel was first analyzed critically by Eichhorn in his Einleitung, Vol. III, pp. 499-533. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung, pp. 323-24 on the history of criticism.

[2] Cf. Wellhausen, CH, pp. 238-66; O. Thenius, Die Bücher Samuelis, ed. Max Löhr (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum A.T., Bd. IV; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1898); H. P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel, ICC (New York: Scribner's, 1929); cf. Norman Snaith, "The Historical Books," OTMS, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 97-102.

The body of traditions in question here has been variously designated by those scholars who do not identify it with E as "the late source,"[4] "the prophetic traditions,"[5] and "the Samuel source."[6] The main passages generally assigned to this group are: I Sam. 1:1-4:1a; 7; 8; 10:17-27; 12; 13:8-15; 15; 16:1-13.[7] They are characterized (1) by the centrality of Samuel in the events surrounding the beginning of the monarchy (cf. especially Ch. 7); (2) by the negative judgment passed on the institution of monarchy. Israel's desire for a king is condemned as an implied rejection of the kingship of Yahweh over his chosen people (I Sam. 8; 10:17ff.; 12:12, 19).

---

[3] First by Karl Budde, Die Bücher Samuel, KHCAT, ed. Karl Marti, Vol. VII (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902). So also in Carl Cornill's Introduction to the Canonical Books of the OT, trans. G.H. Box (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1907). The relation of the sources of Samuel to the Pentateuchal sources is still maintained by O. Eissfeldt (op. cit., pp. 322-39), and by Gustav Hölscher, Geschichtsschreibung in Israel (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1952).

[4] So, R. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 359ff.

[5] So A. Weiser, Introduction, pp. 16ff.

[6] So H. P. Smith, op. cit., pp. xvff.

[7] A. Weiser, op. cit., pp. 166ff.

How reliably does this "Samuel source" reflect attitudes and events of the early monarchy? According to many literary critics we cannot rely on these traditions for accurate depiction of history. H. P. Smith describes the sources as "less concrete" than the other source, which is "earlier and more primitive." The Samuel source "idealizes persons and events," being "dominated by a theological idea." Its "design and method are indicative of a comparatively late date--perhaps in or after the Exile."[8] Pfeiffer's similar judgment is more colorfully expressed:

> With the supercilious indifference to facts typical of some theologians, the authors of the late source glibly proceed to concoct stories and speeches glorifying Samuel and David and vilifying Hophni, Phinehas, and Saul, suppressing when possible or disguising when necessary Saul's noble acts, Samuel's obscure position as a village clairvoyant, and David's detestable actions, which are honestly reported in the old source. . . The mist of legend and the compelling authority of dogma conspire to produce in the late source an atmosphere of make-believe and the illusion of a mirage.[9]

---

[8] H. P. Smith, op. cit., p. xviii.

[9] R. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 363.

Thus, the literary critics of a past generation solved the problems of I Samuel by dividing the contradictory narratives between two sources. The earlier and more reliable of these sources viewed the kingship as a divine gift, intended to save Israel from the Philistines (I Sam. 9:16), and put Samuel in his proper place as an obscure country seer (9:1-10:16). The later and scarcely credible "Samuel source" reflected Israel's bitter experience with the monarchy and showed the bias of prophetic groups who created legends to glorify their revered hero, Samuel.

Nor have most modern critics deviated greatly from the older solution. Martin Noth's work is very similar to that of the older critics, especially Wellhausen, both in the treatment of literary-critical problems and in the question of historicity.[10] While admitting that there was a body of prophetic "Samuel traditions" available to the Deuteronomic Historian, Noth maintains that the historian very greatly altered and supplemented these older traditions. This is especially the case, in Noth's view, in I Sam. 7:2-8:22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25.[11] In these chapters the Deuteronomic historian presents the ministry of Samuel as the last act in the period of the Judges, hence the statement that Samuel "judged Israel" (7:6; 15-17). The historian closes this period with the farewell scene in Ch. 12, which is obviously modeled on Joshua's farewell in Josh. 23-24.[12]

---

[10] M. Noth, ÜSt, pp. 54-61; cf. Wellhausen, CH, pp. 238-48.

[11] ÜSt, pp. 54ff.

By contrast to this we may note the much more conservative views of Eissfeldt, in his monograph Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament. The leading themes of the Deuteronomic history--idolatry, defeat through enemies, repentance, divine grace and assistance--are much older than the Deuteronomic historian of the Exilic period. These themes are inherent in Israelite traditions as early as the 10th century B.C.[13]

It is clear that the contradictions between the scholarly opinions described above cannot be resolved without a fresh analysis of the historical and literary problems involved. Through this analysis, brief as it must be, we hope to show (1) that the "prophetic traditions concerning Samuel" are indeed ancient, and reflect early attitudes and events near the beginning of the monarchy; and (2) that there is a close affinity between these traditions and the E tradition.

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 47, 55, 59f.

[13] O. Eissfeldt, Geschichtsschreibung im AT (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1948), p. 43. Noth himself ordinarily maintains that the Deuteronomic historian follows the traditions which he employs, limiting his own work to arrangement and editorial comments and summaries; see ÜSt, p. 100. Only in regard to the books of Samuel does Noth suppose that the historian actually composed lengthy narratives out of his own imagination, or from only very scant older traditions. Cf. the criticisms of A. Weiser in Samuel: Seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung, FRLANT 81 (Göttingen, 1962), p. 7.

(B) The Age and Character of the "Samuel Source"

First of all we can quickly dispose of the claim that the anti-monarchical tone of these Samuel traditions must reflect a _post facto_ evaluation of the monarchy, stemming from Israel's later experience. In an article published in 1956, I. Mendelsohn demonstrated that this anti-monarchical bias can be entirely historical in eleventh-century Israel:

> . . . On the basis of the new data from Alalakh and particularly from Ugarit, dating from the 18th to the 13th century B.C., there is good reason to assume that the Samuel account /I Sam. 8:4-17/ is an authentic description of the semi-feudal Canaanite society as it existed prior to and during the time of Samuel and that its author could conceivably have been the prophet himself or a spokesman of the anti-monarchical movement of that period.[14]

Not only does the passage accurately reflect Canaanite kingship in the Late Bronze Age, it represents a critique of kingship which has its roots in the very early tribal-league period in Israel. The theocratic pattern of life in the tribal league meant that Yahweh's rule over his people was to be expressed through charismatic leaders whom Yahweh empowered for a given task.[15] The desire of the Hebrews for a king, seen in terms of this ancient ideology, constituted rebellion against the divine ruler of Israel. (Cf. also Judg. 8:23.)

---

[14] I. Mendelsohn, "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," BASOR 143 (1956), pp. 17f.

This ideal of charismatic rule remained a powerful element in the Northern Kingdom long after dynastic succession had been accepted in Judah, as shown by the many occasions on which a Northern king was designated by a prophet. Jeroboam I, Baasha, Elah, Zimri, and Jehu all received prophetic backing; the house of Omri did not. With this custom of prophetic designation, maintaining in another form the older pattern of charismatic leadership, Israel was naturally prevented from developing a firm principle of dynastic succession.[16]

---

[15] Cf. M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT IV:1 [1930]; *idem*, HI, pp. 85-108).

[16] The distinctively charismatic understanding of kingship which prevailed in the Northern Kingdom has been studied in detail by Albrecht Alt in "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," KS, Vol. III, pp. 116-134; cf. also, *idem*., "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," KS, Vol. III, pp. 24ff.

The anti-monarchical attitude of the Samuel traditions can thus be illustrated from the Old Testament and from extra-biblical literature. But what was the relation of this attitude to the role of Samuel? As suggested by G. Ernest Wright, Samuel's creative contribution was a "compromise" whereby the old office of the charismatic judge was to be expressed through two persons, the prophet and the king, with the prophet retaining the direct chrismatic authority of Yahweh, and the king playing a subordinate role as nāgîd or military leader.[17] In other words, the tribal-league form of theocracy proved unworkable under constant Philistine military and economic pressure. Samuel, acting as judge, responded to the crisis by instituting a "limited monarchy" which would exist at the will and word of Yahweh, as revealed through the prophets. Only so could Israel's true relation to her divine King be preserved. Saul and many a later king fell, according to this prophetic point of view, because they refused to stay within the strictly prescribed bounds delimited by Samuel and his successors.

---

[17] See Wright's remarks in "The Lawsuit of God," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 63. Cf. W. F. Albright, Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1961), pp. 15f.

Samuel thus laid the groundwork for the view of the monarchy in the Northern Kingdom. The "Samuel traditions" which represent him in this highly significant transitional role are themselves ancient and historically reliable.

What of the many remaining contradictions in the titles and roles attributed to Samuel? Here again much light has been shed on difficult problems, once the traditions themselves have been taken seriously, as in recent studies by Albright[18] and Weiser.[19]

(C) Samuel and the Cult

It has seldom been sufficiently recognized that all of the traditions concerning Samuel, whatever their source or date, depict him in the closest association with the cult or with some public assembly of the amphictyony. The traditions which show Samuel in some cultic role may be outlined as follows:

I Sam. 1-3--Samuel's parentage, birth, and rearing at the Shiloh sanctuary, where he receives a prophetic call in the presence of the Ark.

---

[18] *Op. cit.*, (see n. 17, above).

[19] *Op. cit.*, (see n. 14, above); also, "I Samuel 15," ZAW LIV (1936), pp. 1-28; *idem*, *Introduction*, pp. 166ff.

Ch. 7-------Samuel issues the command to "put away the foreign gods" and calls "the house of Israel" together at Mizpah, where he prays and offers sacrifice, "judges" Israel, and leads in holy war.

Ch. 8-------Samuel meets with the "elders of Israel" at Ramah, and warns of the nature of the kingship which they are requesting.

9:1-10:16---Samuel, as a "man of God," presides over the local cultus at Ramah, here he is designated a "seer" and appears in association with ecstatic group prophets.

10:17-27----Samuel calls the people together at Mizpah and chooses Saul as king.

11:12-15----Samuel assembles the people at Gilgal where they "renew the kingdom" and "make Saul king before Yahweh in Gilgal."

Ch. 12------Samuel presides over an assembly at an unspecified place, and leads in a ceremony which has marked parallels to Old Testament covenant ceremonies, particularly that depicted in Josh. 24.

13:8-15-----Samuel is expected by Saul to offer sacrifice at Gilgal. When Saul offers sacrifice himself, he is reproved for disobedience.

Ch. 15------Samuel enforces the holy-war ban (חרם) and executes Agag "before Yahweh at Gilgal."

The clear implication is that the involvement of Samuel in the amphictyonic cultus is no creation of the Deuteronomic historian, but is witnessed in every stratum of tradition which we possess. In Weiser's words,

> Dass das Auftreten des Samuel in den verschiedenen Samuel-Traditionen fast durchweg im Rahmen von Versammlungen von

> ganz Israel oder seinen Vertretern dargestellt ist, wird demnach auf geschichtlich zuverlässige Tradition zurückgehen, zu deren Verständnis es nicht erst des Rückbegriffs auf das sog. deuteronomistische Richterschema bedarf.[20]

The many circumstantial narratives of Samuel's role in public assemblies support the summary given in one part of the tradition:

> Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went on a circuit year by year to Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah; and he judged Israel in all these places. Then he would come back to Ramah, for his home was there, and there also he administered justice to Israel. And he built there an altar to the Lord. (I Sam. 7:15ff.; RSV)

The solution which most commends itself is that of Albright, which is supported in detail by the independent literary studies of other scholars, notably Artur Weiser. Albright proposes that Samuel was indeed reared at the Shiloh sanctuary in the last period of that sanctuary's existence as the amphictyonic shrine. Samuel, as is now supported by a 4QSam text, was a נזיר, and perhaps was jealous of the elevated status of the Levitical priests of the sanctuary. In the confused and desperate period following the fall of Shiloh, Samuel gained control of the amphictyony, as a result, we may suppose, of the prominence he had gained as a "seer" and "man of God." Making no effort to restore a single sanctuary or a Levitical priesthood, Samuel instead encouraged charismatic leadership, carried on by prophets and by a נגיד under his own direction.[21]

---

[20] _Samuel_, p. 10.

This reconstruction shows that "all the public roles ascribed to Samuel were probably correct--each in its proper time and place."[22] As one vowed to God's service by his parents, he was a נזיר. The titles שפט, ראה, and נביא are also explicable.

> As charismatic leader of Israel he was automatically also a "judge," that is, a recognized arbitrator because of his inter-tribal role in the amphictyonic confederation of Israel. But as leader and patron of the ecstatic prophets, who had carried on their ancient functions as oracular diviners, he was also a ro'eh, a "seer." Furthermore, continuing ancient West-Semitic and specifically Hebrew custom, he was a navi', one called directly by God to his service, outside hereditary office and royal appointment.[23]

Weiser's analyses of I Sam. 15 and I Sam. 7-12 tend to support Albright's reconstruction from the standpoint of tradition-criticism, and demonstrate that the Deuteronomic historian had at his disposal an already fixed cycle of Samuel traditions, transmitted through cultic and prophetic channels, which were not greatly altered by the historian. These traditions bear the marks, as we have seen, of definite historical and geographical settings, and have as their primary _Sitz im Leben_ the tribal-league assemblies carried out under Samuel's aegis.

---

[21] W. F. Albright, Samuel, pp. 12-18.

[22] Ibid., p. 14.

[23] Ibid., p. 13.

The tradition of I Sam. 12 is particularly interesting for the evidence it gives of Samuel's involvement in a covenant ceremony. The parallels with other covenant texts are many, including: the rehearsal of Yahweh's saving acts toward Israel in the past (vv. 8-13);[24] the announcement of blessings and curses in typically formulated antithetical conditions (vv. 14-15);[25] the apodictic command for obedience (vv. 20-21);[26] and the concluding threat of curse if this obedience is not rendered (v. 25).[27] Baltzer remarks, "Damit wäre das Schema der Bundeserneuerung fast vollständig erhalten."[28] Samuel is depicted as "covenant representative, covenant mediator, and covenant intercessor."[29]

---

[24] Cf. Josh. 24:2-13; Ex. 19:4; 20:2. In spite of the many parallels with the ceremony of Josh. 24, which lead Noth to think the Deuteronomic historian is here simply copying that tradition, there are enough concrete references to a particular situation in the I Sam. 12 text to indicate an independent witness to the same basic covenant form as that found in Josh. 24. See J. Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," VT IX:4 (1959), pp. 361ff. G. von Rad (_Das formgeschichtliches Problem des Hexateuch_, _Gesammelte Studien_ /Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961/, pp. 16f., 63f.) had already pointed out the significance of I Sam. 12 as an important summary of the _heilsgeschichtliche_ tradition, though he had not analyzed, as Muilenburg did, the covenantal structure of the passage.

[25] "Es sind die für die allgemeinen Bestimmungen eines Bundes typischen Verben verwandt." (K. Baltzer, _Das Bundesformular_ /Neukirchen, 1960/, p. 74, n. 6).

Another important text which illuminates Samuel's relation to the amphictyonic cultus is found in the story of his call, I Sam. 3:1-4:1a. This tradition depicts Samuel's call as a nābî' in terms which specify that he succeeded the Shiloh priesthood in religious leadership, after being given the message of doom for that priesthood.

> And Samuel grew, and Yahweh was with him and let none of his words fall to the ground. And all Israel from Dan to Beer-Sheba knew that Samuel was established as a prophet of Yahweh. And Yahweh appeared again at Shiloh, for Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel at Shiloh by the word of Yahweh. And the word of Samuel came to all Israel.
> (3:19-4:1a)

---

[26] Cf. Josh. 24:14, 23; Ex. 20:3-17. On the analysis of the entire chapter as a covenant form, see especially K. Baltzer, op. cit., pp. 74f., and the Muilenburg article cited above (n. 24).

[27] Cf. Josh. 24:19f.; Dt. 27.

[28] K. Baltzer, op. cit., p. 75.

[29] J. Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 361.

This tradition of a nocturnal revelation, undoubtedly preserved by prophets who looked to Samuel as their founder, explains and justifies a revolutionary transfer of authority from priest to prophet--a shift soon made absolutely necessary by the fall of Shiloh and the loss of the Ark. Thus, Samuel's involvement in covenant ceremonies and other amphictyonic assemblies is given its ground in a prophetic call to exercise charismatic leadership. At the same time the priestly modes of revelation are expressly replaced by the prophetic "word of Yahweh."[30]

We conclude that when all of the traditions in I Samuel are taken seriously, there stands out one group of narratives in which Samuel is the key figure, and in which a peculiarly Northern and prophetic view is taken of the institution of monarchy. While these traditions do not represent any single continuous narrative source, as was once thought, they are very similar in their basic emphases and motifs. We should doubtless look to Northern prophetic or prophetic-Levitical circles of the early monarchic period for the bearers of these traditions, for in such circles we would expect to find those who looked back to Samuel as their founder, and who stubbornly maintained the Samuelic attitude toward kingship, which had its roots in the tribal-league theocracy. Thus, we are justified, as Weiser points out, in calling these texts "the prophetic traditions."[31] These traditions are certainly capable of exaggerating Samuel's role because of their peculiar *Tendenz*,[32] but the picture given of his part in the transition to monarchy is basically historical.

---

[30] This analysis, which lends independent support to the view propounded above, was suggested by M. Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, pp. 86-97.

---

[31] In concluding his analysis of I Sam. 15, Weiser states, "Kap. 15 bildet somit die logisch notwendige und darum auch geschichtlich wahrscheinliche Voraussetzung für die spätere Ausgestaltung der Tradition in den Kreisen der Propheten, und auch der Kampf für die Durchführung und Reinheit der Jahwereligion, den der Prophetismus in Nordreich gegen das Königtum später selbst in die Hand genommen hat, baut auf den Erfahrung und Erkenntnissen weiter, die uns in Kap. 15 auf der ersten Königszeit überliefert sind." (ZAW, LIV (1936), pp. 26f.).

[32] E.g., the statement that it was Samuel who routed the Philistines from Israelite territory, I Sam. 7:13f. According to other evidence, it was David who finally eliminated the Philistine threat (II Sam. 8:1). Cf. Noth, HI, pp. 187ff.; Bright, HI, pp. 177ff.; A. Weiser, *Samuel*, pp. 19-21. Weiser proposes that the report of Samuel's involvement in victory over the Philistines may be historical to the extent that Samuel, in his charismatic capacity as holy-war leader, declared the divine judgment against the Philistines, and interceded for Israel in its hour of threat. Surely Samuel's role as "judge" would involve some kind of war with the Philistines, to preserve Israel from becoming Philistine territory after the fall of Shiloh, ca. 1050 B.C.

(D) E and the Prophetic Traditions of I Samuel

The literary critics who ascribe the traditions of I Samuel to the Pentateuchal sources J and E have always identified the prophetic or "Samuel source" which we have just discussed as "E."[33] This is no accident, for there are in fact many striking affinities between E and these traditions. The affinities are mainly theological; the occasional affinities in vocabulary or style are almost always associated with the theological motifs.

(1) Prophecy and the Prophet.--The outstanding feature of these traditions, as we have seen, is the way prophecy and the prophet stand in the center of the presentation of events. This is true even though Samuel is only expressly called a *nābî'* in one tradition, the story of his call at the Shiloh sanctuary (Sam. 3:1-4:1a).

The narrative of Samuel's call displays remarkable affinities with similar traditions in E, particularly the story of Moses' call, Ex. 3:1, 4b, 9-13, 15. The parallel between Ex. 3:4b and I Sam. 3:4b is especially striking:

---

[33] See N. Snaith, "The Historical Books," OTMS, pp.97ff.

Ex. 3:4	I Sam. 3:4
ויקרא אליו אלהים מתוך הסנה	ויקרא יהוה אל שמואל
ויאמר משה ויאמר הנני	ויאמר הנני (Cf. the repeated calls in vv. 6-10; in v. 10 and in the LXX of v. 4, "Samuel!" is repeated twice; cf. Gen. 22:1).

Like Moses, Samuel is called to exercise leadership over the people (Ex. 3:10; I Sam. 3:19ff.) and to save them from a former oppression (Ex. 3:9; I Sam. 3:11-14). As is common in the E tradition, Samuel's prophetic revelation takes place at night (3:3, 15; cf. Gen. 20:6; 28:10ff.; 31:11; 46:2); the same motif appears in another Samuel tradition (I Sam. 15:10, 16).

Like the call of Moses, the call of Samuel stresses the auditory rather than the visual phenomena, even though the conventions of prophetic expression still call for the use of visionary terminology. Thus in I Sam. 3:1, חזון and דבר יהוה are parallel, and in 3:15 Samuel's experience is called a מראה, yet what is related in the narrative is the word which Samuel hears (vv. 10-14). Similarly the E tradition of Ex. 3 emphasizes the word spoken to Moses, in contrast to the J emphasis on what he sees (cf. Ex. 3:2f. (J), and v. 4b (E)).[34]

The prophetic role of Samuel is further defined in later passages in which he intercedes for the people (7:5; 8:6; 19:19, 23). The Hebrew verb used, התפלל , is the same as that used by E in speaking of Abraham's intercession (Gen. 20:7). The role of Moses in E also involved his intercession, as in Num. 11:2.

What is the significance of the emphasis upon the prophet as intercessor, in both E and the prophetic traditions of I Samuel? The most common answer has been that this intercessory role comes from an early phase in the prophetic movement--"from a phase," von Rad says, "in which this movement was connected much more closely with the sanctuary and the cult than at the time of the major prophets. Their office at that time was less the proclamation of eschatological messages than of authorized intercession."[35]

---

[34] The prominence of speaking and hearing in E may be a result of the emphasis on prophecy, as opposed to the more cultically-influenced theophanic pattern in J. Cf. M. Newman, The People of the Covenant (Nashville; Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 47ff.

[35] G. von Rad, Genesis, trans. John Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 223.

In the case of the Samuel traditions we can be more specific than this. Samuel's role as amphictyonic judge and revered seer would naturally entail his acting as intercessor for the tribes before Yahweh. Such action, as Weiser suggests, may be the basis for the tradition of Samuel's involvement in holy war,[36] although some kind of actual military leadership against the Philistines may well have been involved also. If Samuel's attempt at reform included the encouragement of charismatic leadership by local prophetic bands, we may assume that these *n^{e}bî'îm* also came to share in the cultically-connected function of intercession. This would explain Samuel's intercession, and would suggest that the E traditions stem from a period in the prophetic movement when this remained a major part of the prophet's role.

The prophet in the prophetic Samuel traditions, like the prophet in E, has therefore these characteristics: he receives the divine word in nocturnal auditory revelations; he delivers this power-filled word to the people; he represents the people toward God as their intercessor. As the designated messenger of Yahweh, he stands above the king;

---

[36] A. Weiser, *Samuel*, pp. 19-21; cf. n. 32, above.

he is not only independent of the political order, he may be called to direct and order it by virtue of his own charismatic authority. Samuel, at any rate, had such power, and we assume that the circles which preserved these traditions believed that the prophets were always intended to have it.

In the E tradition some of these characteristics of the prophetic role were already attributed to Abraham. But the outstanding model and pattern of the prophet in E was Moses. In a pre-eminent sense Moses is the Lord's representative to Israel and to the great king of Egypt. He brings the people forth from Egypt; he judges them and leads them in holy war; he concludes the covenant between the people and their God; he intercedes for them in their apostasy. To him God speaks "face to face" and "mouth to mouth" and because of the certainty and power of this revelation Moses can rule the people by his word.

It would be difficult to escape recognizing that this E portrait of Moses is almost identical with the portrait of Samuel drawn by the prophetic traditions of I Samuel. In every respect Samuel fulfils the prophetic office of Moses, even to being covenant-mediator, holy-war leader, and judge. Both Samuel and Moses are distinguished by a prophetic role which is primarily one of acting rather than one of speaking; they do not deliver oracles, but plunge themselves deeply into events by asserting their authority over the people of God.[37]

The most probable reason for the marked similarity in the depiction of Moses and Samuel is that the traditions were preserved in the same or related circles. Perhaps the historical figure of Samuel, as remembered by his prophetic followers, actually served as a Vorbild for the figure of Moses among a closely related E-circle. At any rate such a relationship between E and the prophetic traditions of I Samuel would explain the fact that the prophet in E is like Samuel, but is not like the classical nābîʾ of later times.

(2) Prophecy and History.--The affinities between E and the prophetic Samuel traditions extend beyond a mere mutual interest in and emphasis upon prophecy. The very understanding of historical events is influenced by prophetic conceptions.

The simplest way to state this is by comparing two accounts drawn respectively from E and from the Samuel traditions: Gen. 20 and I Sam. 15.

---

[37] G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), Vol. I, p. 293.

We have already pointed out in our discussion of Gen. 20 that in E the whole narrative turns on questions of guilt, sin, and punishment.[38] Abimelech's taking of Sarah is not viewed as mere lust, or even primarily as a threat to the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham, but as a sin against God and against his prophetic representative. Even though done in innocence (20:4ff.), the act endangers the very lives of the king and his people. Only by Abraham's intercession can the king and his subjects be restored to health (20:7, 17f.).

The categories of sin and guilt thus resolve into the categories of obedience and disobedience. The king can be saved through the prophet's intercession if he now renders obedience. The contrast of this profoundly religious understanding with J's more "worldly" presentation (Gen. 12:10-20) is evident.[39]

In I Sam. 15, the whole history of the people of Israel is made to turn on precisely the same factor, the obedience or disobedience of the king. The issue--the *ḥerem* or holy-war ban--is itself significant, for this marks Samuel as an upholder of the ancient amphictyonic traditions of sacral battle over against the encroachments of a secularizing monarchy. Nevertheless, the central point of the narrative is that God demands absolute obedience of the king, for he has sent the king on a mission as his representative (vv. 2-3, 18). The word of Yahweh through his prophet is that which will enforce this obedience through punishment, for the prophet also acts as Yahweh's appointed messenger.[40] To his commanding word no disobedience can be tolerated; Saul's sin is punished by the loss of his kingship.

---

[38] See above, pp. 97f.

[39] Cf. von Rad's discussion of the J passage in Genesis, pp. 162ff.

Thus, in both narratives we have a theological presentation of history. The categories of historical understanding are provided by Israel's covenant faith, as mediated through the prophet. The key issue is that of obedience to Yahweh's word.

> Has Yahweh as great delight in burnt offerings and
> sacrifices
> As in obeying the voice of Yahweh?

---

[40] I Sam. 15:1 (אתי שלח יהוה למשחך עתה שמע לקול דברי יהוה). For a discussion of the type of *Botensformel* underlying this verse, see C. Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Reden* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1960), pp. 70-91.

> Behold to obey is better than sacrifice,
> And to hearken than the fat of rams. (15:22)[41]

(E) Conclusion

The picture of prophecy which is drawn in the prophetic Samuel traditions is in every important respect identical with that given in the E traditions. The correspondences between the figures of Moses and Samuel are exceedingly close. In general, the two traditions use the same language of revelation, speaking in terms of visions and dreams, but emphasizing the auditory aspect of the revelation, the word of Yahweh. The primary time of revelation in both traditions is the night.

Both E and the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel show the prophet in a wide range of functions: he is not only the recipient of revelations and the messenger of Yahweh's word as thus revealed; he is also covenant mediator and intercessor for the people as they gather "before Yahweh."

---

[41] A. Weiser (Samuel, pp. 10ff.) points out that this prophetic pronouncement has nothing to do with a general condemnation of cultic sacrifices, but refers to the immediate situation, in which Saul has taken it upon himself to save some of the captured animals for sacrifice, thus disobeying Samuel's directive. Contrast Albright's remarks, identifying Samuel with a general prophetic condemnation of sacrificial ritual (Samuel, pp. 17ff.).

In both traditions the charismatic leader is the prophet who, at least in the cases of Moses and Samuel, exercises also the authority and funtions of holy-war leader and arbitrating judge. Both king and priest are pushed into the background by this prophet-judge, and the related charisma of the group prophets is also brought under his control.

The understanding of history which arises in both traditions is distinctively prophetic, based upon the covenant categories of obedience and disobedience. Writing of the prophetic traditions of I Samuel, Artur Weiser says:

> From the point of view of the history of tradition and of literature a new manner of presenting and interpreting history is being worked out here which undertakes to explain what has happened and to render it intelligible from the religious point of view. In the background there stands the conflict between worldly and divine power, the clash between king and prophet or judge which brought strong feelings into this manner of regarding history. . . The specially high esteem in which Samuel is held as a prophet in these passages shows that this form of the tradition was developed in the circles of the prophets who regarded Samuel as their ancestor. This is the reason too for the spiritual relationship with the E strand of the Hexateuch, which likewise, though only later on arose out of the interpretation of history in these circles.[42]

Going beyond Weiser's suggestion, we would suggest not only an extremely close affinity, but a very close relation in time between the prophetic traditions of I Samuel and the Pentateuchal E traditions. Indeed, the parallels which we have noted indicate that the circles in which the two bodies of tradition developed were all but identical. If so, we must look for the origin of the E tradition very early in Northern Israel, among prophetic schools who looked back to Samuel as their founder and hero.

---

[42] A. Weiser, Introduction, p. 167.

(II) The Elijah-Elisha Traditions

We have suggested an intimate relation between E and the early prophetic traditions concerning Samuel, emphasizing especially the close similarity in the way the role of the prophet is described. In our consideration of the Elijah-Elisha traditions we shall note some of the same similarities with E in the standing of the prophet and in matters of prophetic theological emphasis. Above all, the evidence is very clear that the Elijah-Elisha traditions, like the traditions previously discussed, were developed and passed on in Northern prophetic circles.

We shall see, however, that the Elijah-Elisha traditions definitely reflect a somewhat different type of prophecy, and a later historical context than the E traditions.

Our dating of E will depend in part on its relationship to both the Samuel and the Elijah-Elisha traditions.

(A) Literary Criticism

That the Elijah-Elisha traditions represent the deposit of independent Northern prophetic traditions has long been recognized by most Old Testament scholars.[43] The Deuteronomic historian's editing seems to consist of arrangement of these older traditions into juxtaposition with his other sources (e.g., the prophetic narratives of I Kings 20; 22; which are thus placed in the context of Elijah's ministry and Ahab's reign), together with occasional comments and summaries which give the traditions their desired significance in the Deuteronomist's over-all plan.[44] The traditions could not have received thorough and detailed reshaping at the hand of the later historian, as Nielsen suggests especially of the Elijah cycle,[45] in view of their magnificently vivid narrative style, the obvious signs of folkloristic embellishment through oral transmission, and the occasional lack of agreement with the Deuteronomic aims and ideals. For example, it is difficult to imagine the Deuteronomic historian, with his constant polemic against extra-Jerusalem worship, composing the story of Elijah's sacrifice upon the Carmel altar (I Kg. 18).[46]

---

[43] James A. Montgomery, The Books of Kings (ICC; New York: Scribners, 1951), pp. 40f.; Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 403-408; Noth, ÜSt, pp. 78ff.; Weiser, Introduction, p. 176; Albright, FSAC, pp. 306f.

[44] Cf. Georg Fohrer, Elia (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957), pp. 45-47.

[45] W. Nielsen, Oral Tradition (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 77.

Most scholars conclude that the Elijah-Elisha narratives reached a fixed form long before the fall of the Northern Kingdom, and were put in writing by ca. 800 B.C. According to Albright,

> The Elijah stories cannot have been handed down long by tradition, since they bear a very close relation to the facts of external history as we know them from other sources, and since they are written in the purest classical Hebrew, of a type which can hardly be later than the eighth century.[47]

Fohrer states that

> Die Bildung und Ausformung der Elia-Ueberlieferung hat sehr bald nach den Geschehnissen begonnen, um die sie

---

[46] This fact led Pfeiffer to postulate that the original Deuteronomic author of Kings must have omitted these chapters, which were added later by a second hand (Introduction, p. 406). Surely it is more reasonable to suppose that the traditions were fixed before the time of the historian and that he, in accordance with his usual method, did not perform any basic alterations on them.

[47] FSAC, p. 307.

> kreist, und ist wohl noch im Ausgang des 9. Jahrhunderts zu einem ersten Abschluss gelangt.[48]

Pfeiffer dates the writing of the Elijah stories about 800 B.C., that of the Elisha narratives about 750.[49]

The traditions of Elijah and Elisha which are embedded in I-II Kings cannot be made into biographies of the prophets, and it is even doubtful whether these narratives existed in the sequence in which they are now found before the Deuteronomic historian's work. Instead, it is probable that the separate stories of the prophets were first passed on orally in the 9th-century circles of their followers, and were only later worked into cycles which give the appearance of continuity.[50] Thus, Noth speaks of "einige Erzählungskränze, die sich um je eine Prophetengestalt gebildet hatten und in der Kreisen der homines religiosi tradiert worden waren."[51]

The Elijah cycle as we now find it in the Deuteronomic historian's work includes I Kg. 17-19; 21- II Kg. 2. The

---

[48] G. Fohrer, op. cit., p. 42.

[49] Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 403ff.

[50] Cf. Fohrer, op. cit., p. 45.

[51] ÜSt, pp. 78ff.

Elisha cycle, partly entwined with the Elijah narratives, begins at I Kg. 19:19 and continues to II Kg. 9, concluding with a postscript, II Kg. 13:14-21.[52] The close and complex relation between the two bodies of tradition, together with the obvious differences in the way the two prophets are represented, constitutes one of the standing puzzles of Old Testament study. Elijah figures mainly in dramatic events in which the rule of Yahweh is threatened, like the great scene on Mt. Carmel (I Kg. 18), or the incomparable confrontation with Ahab in Naboth's vineyard (21:17ff). Yet the prophet himself is not the hero or the real center of interest; this place is reserved for Israel's divine Lord.[53] In the Elisha narratives the folkloristic element is much stronger, and Elisha himself takes the center of the stage as miracle-worker and mover of political events.[54] His pastoral role is much more fully elaborated by the tradition than Elijah's, and he appears in close association with the prophetic guilds. Yet, in spite of all differences, the two figures are very closely related in the traditions concerning them (e.g., I Kg. 19:15-18).

---

[52] J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 41.

[53] G. von Rad, Theologie des AT (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1960), Vol. II, p. 37.

[54] Ibid., p. 41.

In addition to the complex relationship between the two traditions, which indicate that narratives "wandered" between Elijah and Elisha in the oral stage of transmission, there is a fascinating series of parallels between the Elijah-Elisha traditions and the traditions of the ministry of Moses. The most obvious allusions to Mosaic traditions include: Elijah's receiving bread in the morning and meat in the evening (I Kg. 17:6, LXX; cf. Ex. 16:8, 12); his conflict with the Baal prophets (18:20-40), reminiscent of Moses' conflicts with the Egyptian magicians (Ex. 7:8-13, 20-22, etc.); Elijah's journey to Mt. Horeb, where the Mosaic theophany seems to be recapitulated and reinterpreted (I Kg. 19; cf. Ex. 3; 19; 33-34); the passing on of Elijah's authority to Elisha, reminding one of the Moses-Joshua relationship (I Kg. 19:16ff.; II Kg. 2; cf. Dt. 31:14ff.; 34:9); the manner of Elijah's death in an unknown place beyond the Jordan (II Kg. 2; cf. Dt. 34:1-8).[55] As suggested by these references, Elisha seems to play "Joshua" to Elijah's "Moses"; this is true especially of II Kg. 2, in which Elisha, after the death of his master, returns to Jericho after miraculously parting the water of the Jordan with the prophetic mantle which he has received (cf. Josh. 3-4).[56]

---

[55] Cf. Fohrer, *op. cit.*, pp. 48ff.

The many parallels with the traditions of Moses' life indicate that the Elijah-Elisha circles kept alive the Mosaic traditions, doubtless in conjunction with the covenant traditions with which the memories of Moses' ministry were so closely bound up. This suggests a kinship with the Deuteronomic tradition, which likewise represents a northern circle which kept alive the covenant tradition in conjunction with the traditions of Moses' ministry.[57]

---

[56] It is suggested by Prof. F.M. Cross, Jr., that Elijah and Elisha may actually have headed rival schools of prophets, the placing of them in succession being a secondary development. This would account for such anomalies as the discrepancy between the charge to Elijah (I Kg. 19:15ff.) and its fulfilment.

[57] Cf. the suggestion of H.-J. Kraus, Gottesdienst in Israel (Munich, 1954), pp. 110-122 that the prophets inherited the mosäisches Amt through Samuel, the Judges, and Joshua. Although it is still doubtful whether covenant-mediators or covenant messengers constituted an actual sacral office in Israel, it is interesting that E and the related Northern traditions of Samuel and Elijah seem concerned to establish the relation of prophetic figures to Moses, and at the same time picture these figures in covenantal contexts: Cf. Ex. 19:3; 20:18-21; Num. 12:6-8; I Sam. 3:20; I Kg.18:31; 19:8ff. Cf. Julien Harvey's arguments in support of Kraus's position in "Le 'Rîb-Pattern,' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," Biblica XLIII (1962), pp. 172-96.

(B) Historical Background

The single most important fact in Israel's external affairs during the time span of the Elijah-Elisha narratives was the military threat from Aram. This threat, never absent as a ruling factor in the Elisha narratives, is also prominent in the Elijah traditions (cf. I Kg. 19:15ff.) and in the prophetic traditions joined with them (I Kg. 20; 22). From the time of the accession of Ben-Hadad I of Damascus (ca. 880 B.C.), the Northern Kingdom had lived under this constant military and economic pressure. In the time of Ben-Hadad II, Israel was for a time almost wholly occupied by Aram. Samaria itself was not taken, and the Aramean attempt to take it was repelled in a significant victory ca. 956 (I Kg. 20).[58] Still Aram remained the strongest state in the Syro-Palestinian area. The defense of Israel against the Arameans became the most crucial task of Omri (876-869) and his immediate successors.

The shrewd policy by which Israel defended herself against the Aramean threat led, however, to very grave internal problems for the kingdom. Omri's solution was the marriage of his son, Ahab, to Jezebel, daughter of Ittoba'al of Tyre (I Kg. 16:31), and the result was the intrusion into Israel of the worship of Ba'al Melqart and Ashera.[59]

---

[58] Cf. Benjamin Mazar, "The Aramean Empire and its Relations with Israel," BA, Vol. XXV (1962), pp. 98-120; see especially the discussion on pp. 105-109, where Mazar takes issue with Albright's solution (BASOR 87 /1942/, pp. 23ff.), and plausibly separates Ben-Hadad I and II.

The toleration of foreign cults under Ahab was, on the face of it, little different from what had taken place under Solomon. Even the building of a temple to Ba'al Melqart in the newly-founded capital (I Kg. 16:32f.) must have seemed a perfectly natural way for an alien consort to maintain ties with her gods. What was new was the vigorous persecution of Yahwism which arose, being especially directed against the prophetic groups (I Kg. 18:3; 19:1-3; 21:25). It may be that the prophets themselves gave Ahab grounds for this persecution by their refusal to allow him the Solomonic policy of toleration. At any rate the stage was set for a furious struggle for power between the monarchy and the prophets.

Thus, the Elijah-Elisha traditions are permeated by the dual threat of Aram and Baalism. Against these forces the prophets stood as champions and servants of Yahweh, addressing the people in judgment and challenge against Baal, while leading them in holy war against the Arameans.

---

[59] On the identification of Baal Melqart, see Albright, ARI, pp. 156f., 229.

(C) Prophecy and the Prophet in the Elijah-Elisha Traditions and in the E Tradition

A comparison of the description of prophecy and the prophet's role in the Elijah-Elisha traditions with that in E shows up many parallels, but also some important differences. Our discussion can best be carried out under headings which separate the complex functions of Northern prophets in the 9th century.

(1) The Relation to the Monarchy.--Like the E traditions and the prophetic traditions of I Samuel, the Elijah-Elisha traditions presume the prophet's priority over the Israelite king, and even over a foreign king. The absolute authority of prophets over the nation's political affairs was expressed by the use of royal symbols in describing their relation to Israel's divine King. That Elijah presented himself to Ahab and to all Israel as the court herald of Yahweh is suggested by I Kg. 18:15: יהוה צבאות אשר עמדתי לפניו. In the famous encounter with Ahab in Naboth's vineyard, Elijah declares the divine "No!" which answers

Jezebel's question, "Do you now govern Israel?" (I Kg. 21:7)

The very specific involvement of Elijah and Elisha in the political affairs of the Northern Kingdom is evidenced above all by the part which the prophets played in the Jehu revolution. Jehu is anointed by a prophet dispatched on the mission by Elisha (II Kg. 9:3, 6, 12), and then accepted and proclaimed king by the army, acting as representatives of the people. This is exactly the pattern of kingship which Samuel attempted to establish, and the ceremony has the same outline as that performed at the accession of other Northern kings, notably Jeroboam I. Popular acclamation follows upon prophetic anointing, preserving the pattern of charismatic leadership inherited from the amphictyony.

The engagement of both Elijah and Elisha in military affairs, and the prominence of holy-war motifs in the traditions, shows how deep this adherence to amphictyonic ideals went among the prophets. Elijah, earlier protected by divine fire from the soldiers of Ahaziah (II Kg. 1:1-17), is swept away from Elisha by chariots and horses of fire, and is acclaimed by his successor as "the chariot of Israel and its horses." (II Kg. 2:12).

Elisha, who received the same accolade at his death (II Kg. 13:14), was even more deeply involved in holy war, as in the account of the battle with the Moabites (II Kg. 3:9ff.) and in the story of the prophetic instigation of the Jehu revolt, which took on the shape of a holy war against the Ba'al worshipers (cf. II Kg. 9:7ff.). The holy-war ideology permeates the tradition of the siege of Samaria (II Kg. 7), in which Yahweh gives victory through two blind beggars rather than through the king and his military establishment.[60] In the prophetic narrative of I Kg. 20, the unnamed prophet, like Samuel before him, enforces the ḥerem or holy-war ban against the Aramean captives whom the king intended to release. (Cf. I Sam. 15) The tradition of Micaiah's oracle in I Kg. 22 shows the royal custom of obtaining prophetic oracles before battle, though Micaiah refuses to give the favorable answer expected.

We can conclude that the 9th-century prophets, like Moses in E and Samuel in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel, adhered to the traditions of holy war and to the ideal of charismatic rule implied in the holy-war ideology. The king ruled at the behest of the prophet, who stood as the servant and herald of Israel's God.

---

[60] Cf. G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im AT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 53ff.

(2) Prophetic Revelation.--That the Elijah traditions were preserved by circles who had reflected deeply on the nature of revelation is shown by the powerful narrative of Elijah's sojourn at Mount Horeb (I Kg. 19:9-18).

The writer knows of two almost equally attractive recent interpretations of the key passage, vv. 9-15. In both interpretations prophetic revelation is set in a pre-eminent position, which is the significant thing in our discussion.

In the first of these interpretations, that of Prof. Frank M. Cross, Jr., the traditional elements of early Israelite theophanies are explicitly rejected as vehicles of revelation. Wind (רוח), earthquake (רעש), and fire (אש) occur, but Yahweh is not in them (vv. 11b-12a).[61] Finally there comes--nothing: קול דממה דקה .[62] In this silence the Lord speaks to his prophet with the command, "Go!" "Return!" (v. 15). The implication, according to Prof. Cross, is that traditional forms of theophany, even the Sinai and holy-war imagery, are rejected--perhaps in favor of prophetic revelation--since these theophanic images are so closely bound up with the storm-god imagery of Baal.

---

[61] With Montgomery (op. cit., p. 313), omitting vv. 9b-11a as secondary.

[62] Cf. the translation of von Rad: "Die Stimme eines feinen Schweigens" (Theologie des AT, Vol. II, p. 33).

In the opinion of G. Ernest Wright, the wind, earthquake, and fire precede the divine word to the prophet precisely to mark the prophetic revelation as theophanic and as a sequel to the Mosaic revelation. Thus the traditional images of theophany are seen positively and Elijah's succession to the office of Moses is emphasized.

It must be admitted that the exact meaning of the passage remains an enigma. The account is doubtless polemical or propagandistic,but the point has been lost. Yet the general theological concerns of the narrator are clear. The circle responsible for the tradition identifies the role of the prophet with that of Moses and is acutely concerned with the nature and authority of divine revelation.

At a less exalted level, prophetic revelation takes place also through the time-honored means of the "angel of Yahweh" (II Kg. 1:3), and through the ecstasy induced by music (II Kg. 3:15; cf. I Sam. 10:5f.; 19:10ff.). In no passage, however, does a night dream (חלום) or vision constitute the means of prophetic revelation. This is significantly different from the language of E and from the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel; in both of the latter streams of tradition dreams played an important part. By contrast, the most frequent formula of revelation in the Elijah-Elisha traditions is simply, "And the word of Yahweh came to him" (ויהי דבר יהוה אליו).[63] As we have seen, this expression is generally associated with the Deuteronomic school and with Jeremiah, only appearing in the Pentateuch in Gen. 15:1, a chapter which displays signs of later editing.[64]

We may conclude, then, that the three bodies of tradition under discussion all show their prophetic associations by the intense interest accorded the question of revelation. All three traditions present history as the fulfilment of the divine word communicated to prophets. In the E traditions and in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel, these revelations took the form of dreams or visions, even though the auditory aspects of the experience were usually stressed. In the Elijah-Elisha traditions dreams and visions are replaced by the formulaic, "And the word of Yahweh came to him."

---

[63] E.g., I Kg. 17:2, 8; 18:1, 31; 19:9; 21:17, 28. Cf. Fohrer, _op_. _cit_., p. 46.

[64] See above, pp. 122ff.

(3) The Prophet and the Cultus.--In our previous discussion of Samuel's role, we postulated a prophetic attempt to control the amphictyonic cultus after the fall of Shiloh, in the early years of the monarchy. We saw Samuel continually appearing in various cultic roles, and denouncing the king for attempting to displace him in the offering of sacrifice (I Sam. 13). We assume that the followers of Samuel would have continued to adhere to the "Samuel compromise" as an ideal, and thus would try to maintain charismatic control over the cultus, independent of the king.

There are signs in the Elijah-Elisha traditions that a prophet could still act as cult leader in the 9th century, though there is no indication that this was a permanent and regular prophetic function. In the contest with the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel (I Kg. 18), Elijah certainly acts in a cultic role as sacrificer and, in the present text, as covenant mediator.[65] The assembly of "all Israel" (18:19, 20) is like an amphictyonic gathering; like Joshua at Shechem, Elijah challenges the people to choose the god whom they will serve, and to declare their loyalty.[66]

---

[65] Cf. M. Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," pp. 95ff.

[66] Cf. Josh. 24:14f. with I Kg. 18:21.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

Therefore, even if vv. 31-32a are, as many think, a secondary doublet,[67] Elijah is acting as covenant mediator in his capacity as herald of the covenant God. If Prof. Wright's suggestion is correct, this is certainly the case also in the theophany of I Kgs. 19.

In other passages, both Elijah and Elisha act as intercessors, but there is no implication that this is thought to be an important constituent of their role as prophets. Their intercession for the widows in the parrallel narratives of I Kg. 17:20ff. and II Kg. 4:34ff. is a private matter and pertains to the traditional functions of wonder-workers.

We may conclude that Elijah at least could act as a covenant mediator in the crucial period of conflict with Baal, and that another tradition represents him as concerned with the broken covenant (I Kg. 19:10, 14) and perhaps as a second Moses. Otherwise there is no evidence that the prophets or the prophetic guilds had any clear-cut cultic functions in the 9th century. In this respect the Elijah-Elisha traditions distinguish themselves from the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel and from E: both of the latter portray the prophet in important cultic functions.

---

[67] Cf. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 304.

(4) The Prophet versus Israel.--Far more important for the history of prophecy than the sill debatable relation of early prophets to the cult is a shift in the direction of the prophetic address; this change can be dated approximately to the time of Elijah. Whereas earlier prophets, from Samuel on, had addressed themselves primarily to the king, often announcing the divine judgment upon his acts, the prophet now steps into a new role as the proclaimer of the judgment of Israel's God against the whole nation. Where Samuel castigated Saul's disobedience (I Sam. 13; 15) and Ahijah denounced the sins of Solomon (I Kg. 11), Elijah challenges all Israel to be faithful to the covenant. The ancient covenant relation thus received a fresh and profound interpretation under the impact of the Aramean wars and the crisis of Baalism.

> Gewiss, den Satz, dass Israel allein Jahwe angehört, diesen uralten Satz hat Elia wie keiner vor ihm durchgefochten, und doch war er es auch, der über dieses Verhältnis Jahwes zu Israel hinaus noch etwas aussagen sollte, das schlechterdings jenseits von allem lag, was Israel bisher von Jahwe erfahren hatte: Jahwe will den Abfall seines Volkes nicht hinnehmen; er wird gegen Israel aufstehen.[68]

G. Ernest Wright has stated that "The story of the prophet Micaiah in I Kg. 22 (vv. 17-22) furnishes the first documented and datable portrayal of the heavenly rîb"--the sentence of divine judgment pronounced in the heavenly assembly.[69] With this declaration of judgment Dr. Wright associates Elijah's address to all Israel upon Mount Carmel, and his plaint that the whole people of Israel have forsaken the covenant, torn down Yahweh's altars, and killed his prophets (I Kg. 19:14ff.). Dr. Wright concludes that "The same thematic interpretation of the Aramean defeats of Israel appears in the Elisha cycle of tradition (e.g., II Kg. 8:12-13), and, of course, this in turn is used by the Deuteronomic historian (e.g., II Kg. 13:3-6)."[70]

---

[68] G. von Rad, Theologie des AT, Vol. II, p. 38.

This points up something new and profoundly important in the development of Northern prophecy in the 9th century. The close relation to the monarch which was the common pattern in earlier prophecy now gave way to a new conception, in which the prophet stood as the Lord's messenger of judgment against all Israel, including the king. To a certain extent this shift represents a break with the unworkable Samuel compromise, a turning to the entire people of God in the face of the monarchy's failure to obey and to live in the covenant relation. Perhaps this shift was facilitated by the association of prophets with the amphictyonic cultus, beginning with Samuel, which may have been continued in later prophetic involvement in the covenant renewal ceremonies. Certainly the covenant ceremonies maintained, from earliest times, this direct address of God to all Israel. Under the pressure of Israel's 9th-century defeats the prophets may have taken this form of address out of the cultic context and adapted it to prophetic address.

---

[69] "The Lawsuit of God," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 64.

[70] Loc. cit.

When we examine the Pentateuchal materials which can be assigned to E, we do not find any reflection of this *rîb* pattern which Wright has noted in Dt. 32 and in later prophetic passages. The only E text in which there is a suggestion of Israel's breaking the covenant is the narrative about Aaron's golden bull(s) in Ex. 32. But this narrative implies, as we have seen, a polemic against Jeroboam's cultus and against an Aaronid priesthood, not a prophetic indictment of "all Israel" for covenant breaking. The terrible seriousness of the Deuteronomic literature, and of associated earlier literature (e.g., Dt. 32), is lacking in the Elohist tradition. In E, hope still remains for

Israel's obedience to the covenant; the defeat of Israel on the plane of history is not yet in view.

(D) The Relation of E to the Elijah-Elisha Traditions

In our very rapid survey of some central features of the 9th-century prophetic traditions we have seen both similarities and differences when compared with E. Certainly the Elijah-Elisha traditions, like E, reflect their prophetic provenance by their interest in revelation, and in their emphasis on the office of the prophet as Israel's charismatic leader, superior even to the king. The exact means of revelation, however, were described differently; not once in the Elijah-Elisha traditions is there mention of revelation in a night dream or vision.

In both bodies of tradition the prophet could stand in close relation to the cultus as covenant mediator, as was also true of the prophet in the I Samuel traditions.

Most important of all, the Elijah-Elisha traditions, and the associated narrative of Micaiah ben-Imlah, displayed a much deeper emphasis upon the divine judgment pronounced against all Israel. In a corollary development, the prophet stood forth as Yahweh's messenger to the entire people, in contrast to earlier prophets whose audience and object of attack was primarily the king.

This lack of the prophetic rîb in E is paralleled by what we may deduce about the historical background of that tradition. The two great conflicts which faced 9th-century Israel--the conflict with Aram and the conflict with Baalism--are nowhere clearly reflected in the E traditions. There, as we have seen, there is some indication that relations with Aram are still capable of peaceful settlement.[71] At the same time, no sign exists of the massive prophetic struggle with Baalism. The command, "Put away the foreign gods which are in your midst" in Gen. 35:2, has nothing to do with Baalism. The almost verbatim recurrence of this command in a covenant-renewal context in Josh. 24 and in the ritual context of I Sam. 7 shows that this is an old Northern cultic formula used in preparations for covenant renewal and perhaps for holy war; the apodictic formulation suggests covenant-renewal as the original Sitz im Leben of the formula.[72] There remains no passage which implies the struggle with paganism which beset Israel from the 9th century until the nation's downfall.[73]

---

[71] Commenting on Gen. 31:43ff., von Rad remarks, "It apparently goes back to a very old boundary agreement, which was made between Israelites (settlers east of the Jordan) and an Aramaic tribe "Laban," and it must derive from the time of the first rather peaceful encounter with the Arameans in Gilead. It was, therefore, a harmless affair in contrast to the deadly Aramaic wars in which Israel was involved in the ninth and eighth centuries" (Genesis, ET, p. 307).

We conclude that the E tradition finds closer parallels, both in historical background and in the development of prophecy which is reflected, in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel. The Elijah-Elisha traditions, while they show themselves to be part of the same stream of Northern prophetic literature, display important differences which indicate that they spring from a later situation than the I Samuel traditions or E. In the next section we shall develop an argument for a more precise dating of E in the period between Samuel and Elijah.

---

[72] Cf. A. Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," KS, Vol. I, pp. 79-88.

[73] Even if an E tradition of the worship of Baal-Peor can be distinguished in the fragmentary narrative of Num. 25:1-5, which is doubtful, the passage is not significant at this point. What is reflected there is not the great conflict with Baalism of the 9th and 8th centuries, but a fragment of an ancient tradition about early rebellion during the wilderness period--a tradition that once must have existed in fuller form, to judge from the many allusions to it in the OT; cf. Num. 31:16; Hos. 9:10; Dt. 4:3; Josh. 22:18; Ps. 106:28.

(III) The Date and Provenance of E

(A) The Political Context

We have proposed that the origin of the E traditions must be sought in the period between Samuel and Elijah, and that there is evidence of closer connection with the situation of prophecy in Samuel's time and after, than with Elijah's era. Hence we are led to consider the century following Samuel's ministry as the most probable time for the origin of the E tradition. At what point in the 10th century might the E tradition have been put into a more or less fixed form? What historical circumstances would call forth such a distinctively prophetic and Northern molding of the common epic tradition?

Our first line of evidence is analogical. A number of scholars now accept as established the close connection of the Yahwist epic with the revolutionary changes which brought Israel into being as an empire with a dynastic monarchy and a royal cultic establishment in Jerusalem. These vast changes culminated in the reign of Solomon, and it is to the reign of Solomon that the first Israelite history-writing is attributed. The established monarchy, Israel's new place as a world power, the great economic success of the new kingdom, a splendid temple and a brilliant court: all these combined to produce a new atmosphere in which Israel sought an understanding of herself in her own sacred historical traditions. Hence the composition, probably during Solomon's time, of the J epic.[74]

By analogy we may assume that the composition of the E tradition was also called forth by some important and profound change in the people's life and place in history, this time in North Israel. Such a change occurred after the death of Solomon, ca. 922 B.C., when the Northern section of the Kingdom broke away and established itself as an independent state with Jeroboam I as king (I Kg. 11:26-12:33). Just as David had "brought Shiloh to Jerusalem" by transferring the Ark to the seat of the monarchy,[75] Jeroboam established his own rival royal sanctuary at Bethel, with another at Dan in the far north. The Bethel sanctuary had ancient associations with the amphictyony and even a tradition of patriarchal founding. The capital of the new kingdom was Shechem, also a city with ancient cultic associations. Thus, the new state was established with a rival cultic and political order which had its own claim to venerable precedent. These developments might well have provided the context for the composition in the new Kingdom of a rival version of the old epic tradition.

---

[74] Noth, HI, p. 220; Weiser, Introduction, p. 108; von Rad, OT Theology, Vol. I, pp. 40ff.; G. E. Wright, God Who Acts (London: SCM, 1952), p. 73, n.1; J. Bright, "The Modern Study of OT Literature," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. G. E. Wright (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 18.

[75] von Rad, OT Theology, Vol. I, p. 43, citing O. Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem," VT Supp. VI (1957); cf. J. Bright, HI, pp. 179ff.; A. Alt, "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," KS, Vol. II, pp. 46ff.

If we pursue the implications of this analogical argument, a new and more direct line of evidence presents itself. The division of the Kingdom, according to ancient tradition (I Kg. 12:1-20),[76] was the result of Northern opposition to the oppressive policies of Solomon, and had its roots in a hostility to the Davidic dynasty. This is indicated by the repetition, "like a national anthem,"[77] of the outcry of earlier rebels against David:

---

[76] The antiquity of the tradition is indicated by the remark in 12:19, "So Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day." The tradition must have been fixed before the fall of the Northern Kingdom. According to Noth (ÜSt, p. 79), it is part of an ancient and unified prophetic tradition concerning the reign of Jeroboam I, found in I Kg. 11:29-31; 12:1-20, 26-31; 14:1-18.

[77] Montgomery, _op_. _cit_., p. 250.

What portion have we in David?
We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse.
To your tents, O Israel!
Look now to your own house, David.
(I Kg. 12:16; II Sam. 20:1)

The rebels rejected the Solomonic pattern of kingship and returned to the earlier form of monarchy instituted by Samuel.[78] Jeroboam was first designated king by a prophet (I Kg. 11:29) and then accepted as king by all the people in an assembly at Shechem (I Kg. 12:20).

Thus, the Northern monarchy in its inception was backed by Northern prophets and was intended to follow the pattern of rule established between Samuel and Saul. The supposition arises that this movement would provide a perfect situation for the composition of a Northern epic by members of a prophetic circle who adhered to the Samuelic compromise and viewed Israel's past in prophetic categories.

One element in the E tradition serves to tie its composition even more closely to the Division of the Kingdom and the reign of Jeroboam I. This is the polemical account of the making of the "golden bulls" in Ex. 32. The text is clearly to be understood in relation to the new king's cultic establishment at Bethel.

---

[78] A. Alt, "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," KS, Vol. II, pp. 121ff.; cf. Bright, HI, p. 211.

(B) The Cultus of Jeroboam I

In an act parallel to Solomon's founding of the Jerusalem temple, Jeroboam set up his own royal sanctuary at the ancient shrine of Bethel, thus providing for the new nation an official cult center.

The details concerning Jeroboam's establishment are preserved by the Deuteronomic historian in I Kg. 12. The tradition reports the setting up of altars at Bethel and Dan, and the staffing of these holy places with Jeroboam's own priesthood. The narrative further reports the king's designation of a festival (חג) in the eighth month, over which he himself presided at Bethel (I Kg. 12:31-33).

The horrified interest of the historian focuses on the "calves of gold" which Jeroboam introduced into the worship of his kingdom, proclaiming, הנה אלהיך ישראל אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים. Clearly the historian is concerned to condemn Jeroboam's action; he views the "calves" as idols to be worshipped as Israel's gods.

As is now recognized by a number of scholars, this interpretation completely misses the point of Jeroboam's action. What was involved was not an introduction of new gods or a return to paganism, but simply the introduction of a new type of cultic imagery, parallel to the cherubim of the Jerusalem temple. The bulls[79] themselves were not intended as representations of the Deity, but were the pedestals upon which Yahweh invisibly stood, just as he was said to be enthroned upon the cherubim.[80]

> In the primitive religions of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, the sacred animal is not the god and is not confused with the god; it merely embodies his attributes, is an ornament of his throne or a support for it, or a footstool for his use. The Temple of Jerusalem had the Ark, and the Cherubim above it formed the throne of Yahweh; Jeroboam needed something similar for the sanctuaries he founded and he made the 'golden calves' as the throne for the invisible godhead.[81]

The orthodoxy of Jeroboam's intention is shown by the very firmness with which Yahweh is identified as the God who brought Israel out of Egypt. The plural form of the verb in 12:28 does not necessarily mean that אלהיך is thought of as plural, since אלהים can and frequently does take the plural verb. In any case, the singular verb in the same expression in Neh. 9:18 establishes the meaning of the formula.[82]

---

[79] The word עגל could be used of a young bull, as in Ps. 106:19-20, where it is parallel to שור אכל עשב. Cf. Albright, FSAC, p. 300, n. 33. In Ugaritic, the plural is used in one text for "year-old bullocks" (*^{c}glm dt snt*); see C. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1948), Text 51: VI: 42; cf. Glossary, No. 1449.

[80] Pss. 80:2 (EV 80:1); 99:1; Isa. 37:16.

[81] R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, trans. John McHugh (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), pp. 333f. See, in addition to the references cited on p. 166, n. 164, O. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," ZAW LVIII (1940-41), pp. 190-215; G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archeology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), pp. 147ff. and, recently, W. Harrelson, "Calf, Golden," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 488f.

The particular relevance of the bull symbol at Bethel, "the house (sanctuary) of El," is explained by the use of the bull as the symbol of El in Canaanite iconography and literature.[83] Hence, it appears that Jeroboam was by no means a paganizer or even an innovator, but was returning to an ancient El-symbol. The acceptability of an El symbol in the cult of Yahweh was made possible by the very early identification of Yahweh with or approximation of the attributes of El. As a result, the most orthodox circles in Israel used symbols and language relating to El with no embarrassment, although they could never use Baal motifs in the same manner.[84] In any case, we can view the cultic establishment of Jeroboam as an orthodox attempt to rival Jerusalem in every respect; possibly what was involved was a revival of very ancient symbols and practices current at Bethel, and related to a patriarchal El cultus at that place.

---

[82] A plural verb is used with אלהים in Gen. 20:13; 35:7 (both E). Cf. F. M. Cross, Jr., "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," HTR LV:4 (1962), p. 257, n. 141.

[83] The expression ṯr. ʾil, "Bull El," occurs in several Ugaritic texts (Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook*, Texts 49: IV: 34, VI: 26-27; 51: III: 31). See F. M. Cross, Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 258; M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, VT, Suppl. IV (1955), pp. 35-41.

[84] F. M. Cross, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 250-59.

We have stated, however, that the Ex. 32 tradition preserved by E is presented in the form of a polemic against Jeroboam's cultus and against its Aaronic priesthood.[85] What would be the basis for such a negative judgment by the prophetic group who had supported the new monarch at his accession?

Plainly, Jeroboam did not adhere to the Samuel compromise once he was in power. The old struggle between prophet and king must have been promptly renewed; Jeroboam had the clear intention of reigning on the pattern with which he himself was most familiar--the Jerusalem (and Canaanite) pattern. This is demonstrated by his establishment of an official royal sanctuary, later described in Amos 7:13 as "a royal chapel and a dynastic temple."[86] It is precisely this establishment, with its bull symbol and allegedly Levitical priesthood,[87] which the E tradition of Ex. 32 castigates. Jeroboam's action meant rebellion against the prophetic authority under which he was first designated monarch and, even worse, a shattering of the sacred unity of Israel, symbolized by the amphictyonic Ark of Yahweh at Jerusalem. The E tradition is thus thoroughly in accord with the perennial hostility of Israel's prophets to sanctuaries other than Jerusalem, still reflected in the Deuteronomic historian's materials in I Kg. 12-13.[88] There is also every reason to suppose that the Samuelic attitude toward kingship, so clearly reflected in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel, is here echoed by E.

---

[85] The Deuteronomic historian's claim (I Kg. 12:31) that Jeroboam's priests were not Levitical must have been prompted by their claim to Levitical descent, as suggested by Albright, ARI, p. 110; FSAC, p. 299. Aaron's place in Ex. 32 confirms the association of the bulls with the Aaronic priesthood.

[86] מקדש מלך ובית ממלכה , using the translation of Bright in HI, p. 218.

It appears very likely, therefore, that the E tradition arose and received its peculiar stamp in a North-Israelite prophetic or prophetic-Levitical circle during the 11th-10th centuries, following the time of Samuel. The clear polemic against Jeroboam I's Bethel sanctuary suggests the late 10th century as the *terminus ad quem* for this process, since the site of Bethel soon passed into the control of Rehoboam and was held by the Southern Kingdom for more than a century.[89]

---

[87] Cf. n. 85, above. It also follows that the circles behind the Ex. 32 traditions and the I Kg. 12-13 traditions must themselves have claimed association with the true Levitical priesthood.

[88] The prophetic adherence to the ideal of one central sanctuary is now definitively discussed by Sadao Asami in an unpublished Harvard doctoral dissertation,

(C) E as a 10th-century Epic

We have proposed as a context for the final formulation of the E epic the Northern Kingdom, shortly after the division of the Kingdom in 922 B.C., and have identified the tradition-circle responsible as a Levitical and perhaps a prophetic school in the North descending from the time of Samuel.

Such a dating of E contrasts so sharply with most earlier works, that we must state how this date explains commonly accepted characteristics of E more satisfactorily than the previously almost universal 8th-century date.

The literary-critical argument for the 8th-century dating of E proceeded in two stages. First, E was dated as relatively later than J. Then an appropriate date was sought for E, in accordance with some evolutionary scheme of the development of Israel's religion (see Ch. I, above).

---

[89] See F. M. Cross, Jr., and G. Ernest Wright, "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," JBL LXXV (1956), pp. 202-226; cf. especially pp. 222-23, where the argument is based on II Chron. 13:19.

In both stages of this argument, four characteristics of E were appealed to: (1) The interest in prophecy; (2) The lack of anthropomorphism in representations of the Deity, gross features of earlier theophanies being replaced by the appearance or speaking of God in a dream or vision; (3) A higher ethical sensibility than that apparent in J, since the E traditions attempt to exculpate the patriarchs when their actions are morally dubious (e.g., Gen. 20:12; 31:1-16); (4) A more developed and reflective view of history than J's. These characteristics were almost unanimously thought to point to a date in the 8th century, in the beginnings of classical prophetism.

Even if we accept the above description of E's characteristics, tendentious as it may be, we can explain these characteristics more pointedly in a 10th-century Levitical-prophetic context, once it is granted that the basic faith and institutions of Israel were already established long before the prophetic movement of the 8th century.[90]

In the 10th-century prophetic milieu there would naturally be great interest in the problems of revelation, and a natural tendency to picture the great figures of Israel's past as prophets. The common device of the dream or vision in revelations of the Deity--which is certainly extremely ancient in Near Eastern religions[91]--is the result of this prophetic perspective, not of a higher degree of theological sophistication than J displays. In other words, the dream or vision as a device of the narrator has nothing to do with anti-anthropomorphism; it simply reflects the prophetic categories in which he thinks.[92]

---

[90] This view, of course, is gaining increasing acceptance. Cf. G. Mendenhall, "Biblical History in Transition," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, pp. 32-49.

Similarly, the manner of depicting the patriarchs does show an awareness of ethical categories. But again, this is the result of modeling them on great prophetic figures like Samuel. It is not a question of sophistication, but of the type of Vorbild used, and the acute awareness of the covenant categories of obedience and rebellion is something which we should expect in a prophetic environment.

---

[91] See the treatment of A. Leo Oppenheim, The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East, American Philosophical Society Proceedings, Vol. XLVI, Part 3 (Philadelphia, 1956).

[92] In any case, one cannot distinguish the age of the narrative strands by the criterion of "anthropomorphism," since all (including P) have anthropomorphic features; cf. A. Bentzen, Introduction, Vol. II, p. 50.

The same can be said for the view of history which is taken in E. E's understanding of history is not more "advanced" than J's; it is more unified and simple because it is the product of a specific prophetic milieu. In fact, the scope of E's understanding, like the scope of the epic itself, is narrower, less cosmopolitan, less subtle than J's, precisely because everything is brought captive to prophetic categories.

The 10th-century date for E, then, can explain its peculiarities more simply and more credibly than an 8th-century date, and can explain them in a way which is less bound up with 19th-century historiographical and philosophical ideas. In addition, the 10th-century date makes the prophetic emphasis of E more pointed. The stress on prophetic categories and on the role of the prophet in events implies a definite polemic, other signs of which we find in North Israelite traditions. In every depiction of a past hero as a prophet there is an implied rebuke to the Northern monarchy, precisely parallel to Samuel's rebuke of Saul, and to Ahijah's castigation of Solomon. Perhaps this polemic is specifically directed against Jeroboam's royal establishment at Bethel immediately after the Division; there seems to be strong evidence for this. At any rate the prophetic emphasis of E reflects the tense situation in the early days of the Kingdom, when king and prophet vied for control of Israel's destiny.

CHAPTER V

E AND LATER NORTH-ISRAELITE TRADITIONS

In the last chapter we argued for a 10th-century dating of E. Viewing the E tradition in the context of early Northern prophecy, we attempted to show that the type of prophetic activity and theology reflected there falls in the period between Samuel and Elijah. The new royal establishment in the North following Solomon's death, we suggested, must have provided the context for the crystallizing into writing of this distinctively Northern version of the old common epic tradition.

In any event, there are evident connections between E and the early Northern prophetic traditions concerning Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, and we have had occasion to discuss these connections in some detail. How does E compare with the Northern traditions whose fixation in writing was somewhat later? We shall answer this by discussing Hosea and Deuteronomy in relation to E and in relation to the whole stream of early Northern traditions of which E is a part. We cannot pretend to do this study in all the completeness and detail which it deserves; such an undertaking could well demand a separate dissertation in itself, especially if the equally important traditions of Jeremiah were included. We shall merely suggest the relevance of our study of E and related early Northern traditions to a broader study of all of the North Israelite traditions, and we shall ask whether our reconstruction of the development of early Israelite prophecy finds support from the texts of Hosea and Deuteronomy. If it does, then our early dating of E will gain in plausibility.

(A) Hosea

Parallels and similarities between Hosea and E seem especially possible because of the profusion of Hosea's references and allusions to events in Israel's history.[1] The most recognizable of these direct and indirect references can be listed as follows:

---

[1] Little detailed work has been done, as far as this writer can ascertain, on the relation of Hosea to E and to other Northern traditions. Most of the commentators concentrate their attention on the problems of interpretation in Hos. 1-3 and on textual problems; cf. the recent bibliography cited by J. D. Smart in his article, "The Book of Hosea," IDB, Vol. II, pp. 648-53, and the survey of H. H. Rowley, "The Marriage of Hosea," BJRL XXXIX (1956-57), pp. 200-233. Some of the most pregnant comments are those of Albrecht Alt in his "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," KS, Vol. II, pp. 250-75. The most complete recent listing of works dealing with Hosea's historical allusions is in Hans Walter Wolff's Hosea (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. XIV /Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961/, pp. xxx-xxxi. See also the Introductions, especially Weiser, pp. 232ff.

Hos. 4:2	cf. Ex. 20:1-17
8:5-6; 10:5-6	cf. Ex. 32; I Kg. 12:25-33; 13
8:12	cf. Ex. 31:18; 32:15-16; 34:1, 28; Dt. 31:9ff.
8:13; 9:3; 11:5	*passim* in Exodus
9:10	cf. Num. 25:1-5
11:1-4	*passim* in Numbers
12:2-6, 12	Gen. 25:22-26; 27:43; 28:11-22; 29:18-20; 30:31-31:20; 32:22-32
12:13	*passim* in Ex. 3-4; Num. 12; Dt. 34:10
13:4-6	cf. Ex. 17:1-7; Num. 11:4-6

For greater ease of discussion these can be arranged thematically as follows: Jacob, Moses, the Covenant, the Golden Calf, the Wilderness, Kingship.

(1) Jacob: 12:2-6, 12

Hosea's use of motifs drawn from the Jacob narratives of Genesis suggests a direct familiarity with them as living traditions rather than a secondary literary use of them in some written form. With great freedom the prophet mentions, but not in chronological order, Jacob's birth, his flight to Aram, his theophanic experience at Bethel, his service for Laban to procure a wife, and his wrestling with an angel. The references are thus to every basic motif of the Jacob tradition as we have it, but not to specifically

J or E versions of that tradition. Indeed, there are clear signs that Hosea has access to an independent stream of tradition, perhaps oral, which does not duplicate in detail the JE narratives as we have them. For example, 12:4a has Jacob "heeling" his brother in the womb rather than after their birth, as in Gen. 25:26a. Jacob's weeping and beseeching favor is not contained in the parallel Genesis narrative of the encounter with the angel at Penuel (Gen. 32:24-32), generally attributed to J. Hos. 12:5b parallels the J account of Jacob's stay at Bethel in Gen. 28 in which the familiar J promise of seed and land are given. But Hos. 12:7, apparently intended to convey the content of Yahweh's promise to Jacob, in no way resembles the speech of Yahweh found in the J tradition of Gen. 28:13b-15.[2]

We must conclude that Hosea, while richly illuminating the tenacity and continued vigor of the patriarchal traditions in Israel, in no way demonstrates a direct literary knowledge of our J or E. Those like Procksch who claim that Hosea shows undoubted and exclusive knowledge of E cannot produce convincing evidence of such dependence on the basis of his references to the Jacob legends.[3]

---

[2] Cf. Th. C. Vriezen, "La Tradition de Jacob dans Osée XII," Oudtestamentische Studien, ed. P.A.H. de Boer (Leiden: Brill, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 64-78.

[3] O. Procksch, op. cit., pp. 248-55.

(2) Moses: 9:3; 11:5; 12:13

Similarly, with respect to the Moses-Exodus traditions, we must differ with Procksch, who states, "Es sind also kein Grund hier für Hosea eine andere Quelle als E vorauszusetzen."[4] In detail there are as many allusions to J narratives as to E, or (as in the case of 9:3; 11:5; 13:4-6) the references are simply too general to specify.

In only one important respect can we establish a connection with E and other early Northern traditions. This is in Hosea's explicit description of Moses as a prophet in 12:4 (EV 12:13):

ובנביא העלה יהוה את ישראל ממצרים ובנביא נשמר

Here, surely, we are encountering a later echo from the Northern tradition circles which we have discussed, including those responsible for E. We are reminded of the E narrative of the call of Moses (Ex. 3:1, 4b, 9-13, 15) and of the narrative of Samuel's call (I Sam. 3), which falls into the same pattern. The E tradition's view of Moses' prophetic role was also evident in Num. 11-12, where the seventy elders prophesy when a portion of Moses' spirit is given them, and Moses is designated as the one with whom Yahweh speaks "mouth to mouth, clearly, and not in dark speech" (Num. 12:8). We saw the same tendency to view

---

[4] *Ibid*., p. 252.

Moses' ministry in prophetic categories in the Elijah narratives, where Elijah is depicted as a second Moses.

Because of these similarities--they are, significantly, theological rather than in terms of strict content--we may assume that Hosea stands in the same line of Northern prophetic tradition which we found reflected in E. At the same time, we find so far no unequivocal reference to the E tradition as we have it in the Pentateuch.

(3) The Covenant: Hos. 4:2; 8:12

The allusion to God's writing of his laws for Israel (8:12) is such a general reference that we cannot determine what version of the Sinai tradition Hosea knows. There are references to the tablets of stone which contained the דברים written by God in both J and E contexts (Ex. 32:15-20; 34:1-4, 27-29) and a reference to Moses' recording of God's תורות in Dt. 31. There is no basis here, then, for asserting that Hosea has exclusive knowledge of one tradition.

In 4:2 Hosea makes typically free use of the contents of the Ten Commandments, specifically paralleling Ex. 20:7, 16, 15, 14.[5] Older scholars--Procksch, for example--felt that this allusion established Hosea's dependence upon E, since it was generally agreed that Ex. 20:1-17 contained the "E Decalogue."[6] As we have seen, the relation of Ex. 20:1-17 to the E Sinai narrative is problematical; the Decalogue could well be a secondary insertion into that narrative. Here again we cannot make any definite conclusion about Hosea's affinities with E.

---

[5] Cf. Spiegel, "A Prophetic Attestation of the Decalogue," HTR XXVII (1934), pp. 105-44.

It is true, on the other hand, that Hosea's strong emphasis on the covenant places him in the same stream of Northern tradition which is represented by the Elijah narratives and, as G. Ernest Wright has shown, the Song of Moses, Dt. 32. Precisely as in Dt. 32 and I Kg. 18 the covenant is a broken covenant for Hosea, and all Israel is charged by tho prophet with the blame for destroying the covenant relation with Yahweh. This somber view of Israel's apostasy and the prophetic address to all Israel reflect a later development, as we saw previously, than the Samuelic-Elohistic view of the prophet's role. Again, nothing definite can be said about Hosea's relation to the E epic tradition, but his affinity with the same general theological outlook is clear.

(4) The Golden Calf: Hos. 8:5-6; 10:5-6

In both passages in Hosea which mention the making of a calf (עגל), the allusion is to the bull images installed by Jeroboam I rather than to the E narrative about Aaron's bulls, Ex. 32. This is suggested by the fact that both passages have as their immediate context a condemnation of Israelite kingship. In addition, there is in the בית און of 10:5 an obvious sarcastic reference to the royal sanctuary at Bethel. The direct connection of the calf with Samaria in 8:5 establishes this as the frame of reference beyond any doubt.

---

[6] Cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 252; see above, pp. 149ff.

It is clear, then, that Hosea shares in the same prophetic condemnation of Jeroboam I which we saw reflected in the E tradition of Ex. 32, and in the narrative traditions of I Kg. 12-13. Jeroboam's establishment and the continuation of it by later kings constitutes a direct affront to Yahweh.[7] On this important point Hosea thoroughly agrees with the E tradition and with the generally anti-monarchical bias of the Northern prophetic schools. Again we can establish an important ideological affinity, but no direct literary contact between Hosea and E.

(5) The Wilderness: Hos. 9:10; 11:1-4; 13:4-6

The latter two of the three passages cited here make free lyric use of the Wilderness theme without any clear reference to a specific Pentateuchal narrative. It is true that 13:4-6 might refer to the tradition which we have in Num. 11, and Hos. 11:1-4 might allude to the Baal-

---

[7] Cf. above, pp. 256-62.

Peor incident of Num. 25:1-5 (see below), but no more than general knowledge of these traditions is necessarily reflected in Hosea.

In Hos. 9:10, however, Hosea clearly refers to the Baal-Peor story which we know from Num. 25:1-5 and from other scattered passages in the Old Testament (Num. 31:16; Dt. 4:3; Josh. 22:17; Ps. 106:28). But as we have seen we cannot go further than to ascribe the Numbers narrative to JE (see above, pp. 180ff.). Our conclusion is that Hosea refers to Wilderness narratives and motifs which are common to both J and E. If there is anything in Hosea's use of these themes which is peculiarly prophetic and North-Israelite, it is in the exceedingly somber negative judgment which he passes upon Israel by means of these passages. The covenant, as we observed above, is only known to Hosea as a broken covenant; even the time of Israel's childhood was a time of apostasy. Through his use of the Wilderness themes Hosea declares the divine rîb against Israel with striking poetic intensity.

(6) Kingship: 8:10; 13:9-11

Hosea's judgment on Israel's kings and on the institution of kingship itself is entirely negative. In the day of punishment and renewal which is coming, Hosea declares, there will be neither king nor prince in Israel (3:4).

Kingship shatters the intimate father-son relation of God to Israel; Yahweh gave Israel kings only in his anger (8:10; 13:9-11).

There is no doubt that this accords with the characteristically North-Israelite prophetic view of kingship which had its roots in tribal-league theocracy. We have found it before in the Elijah-Elisha traditions and in the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel. It is also reflected in the E tradition, particularly in the vigorous polemic against Jeroboam's cultic establishment at Bethel. This latter theme also appears in Hosea, who expressly condemns the entire royal establishment of worship (4:15; 8:5, 11-13). On the subject of kingship, then, Hosea stands in the line of tradition to which E is related and which finds its clearest early expression in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel.[8]

(7) Conclusion

Surveying the results of our discussion of Hosea in relation to E, we cannot find any evidence for a direct literary knowledge of the E tradition on the part of Hosea. It appears instead that Hosea made free and frequent use of the common epic tradition, which was still vital and far richer than we would expect on the basis of our written Pentateuch alone.

---

[8] The negative view of kingship is the first bond which Alt finds to link Hosea, Deuteronomy, and earlier Northern traditions; "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," KS II, pp. 250ff. Contrast H.S. Nyberg's theory that Israel's crisis, as reflected in Hosea, is purely religious and that the references to kings, especially in such a passage as 10:7, are actually references to the god melek or Malik. This theory is impossible, in view of such obviously historical references as 8:4; 13:10-11. Cf. the criticisms of J. Mauchline, "Hosea," IB, Vol. VI, pp. 555-56; (Nyberg, Studien zum Hoseabuche /Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1935/).

Theologically and ideologically, however, Hosea displays striking similarities with E and with the whole stream of Northern traditions of which E is a part. This similarity is especially marked in the emphasis placed on the prophet's role in Israel's history and in the negative evaluation of the kingship.

Equally significant is the way in which Hosea takes over and deepens the declaration of the divine r̂ib or lawsuit against Israel. Here he goes beyond the comparatively optimistic outlook of E. He thus betrays a date later than E and even than the Elijah tradition, for the threat of Baalism and the failure of Israel's political institutions have reached an acute stage. Our discussion of Hosea thus provides a larger perspective for our description of the early Northern prophetic-levitical circles to which we attribute E and demonstrates the continuing vitality, right to the end of the Northern Kingdom, of those tradition circles. In the oracles of Hosea we find, in an intensified form, those theological emphases and religious insights which we first encountered in the E tradition.[9]

(B) Deuteronomy

Before discussing the relation between Deuteronomy and the E tradition it would be well to make clear the critical assumptions which will underlie our discussion. The first of these is the very generally accepted theory that the "book of the law" promulated during Josiah's reign in *ca*. 622 B.C. forms the core of our Deuteronomy, but that the work then put forward was based on a body of very ancient traditions, being no *de novo* creation of a 7th-century Judean author.[10]

Secondly, we are accepting without detailed discussion the Northern provenance of the Deuteronomic traditions. Independently proposed many years ago by Adam Welch and Theodor Oestreicher, the origin of this tradition in Northern circles has been well supported by the work of Albrecht Alt, Gerhard von Rad, and G. Ernest Wright.[11] Northern provenance is suggested by the marked affinities of Deuteronomic theology and language with known Northern literature such as Hosea and Jeremiah. Furthermore, the tradition lacks the characteristic Jerusalem emphases upon the inviolability of Zion and the Davidic dynasty.[12] In place of these royal themes we find in Deuteronomy a resurgence of the amphictyonic holy-war ideology and the tribal league covenant theology.[13] The prominence of Shechem in the cultic observances mentioned makes it probable that the Deuteronomic tradition stems ultimately from the sanctuary at Shechem. The form and style suggest that the book comprises an anthology of the Levitical preaching and teaching which was given there in liturgical contexts, perhaps in covenant-renewal ceremonies.[14]

---

[9] Cf. A. Alt, *op*. *cit*., p. 273.

[10] Cf. the discussion of G. Ernest Wright, "Deuteronomy," IB, Vol. II, pp. 320ff., with the bibliography cited there.

[11] Th. Oestreicher, *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1923); A. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (London: Jas. Clarke, 1924); G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. David Stalker (London: SCM Press, 1953); G. Ernest Wright, *op*. *cit*., pp. 324ff.; A. Alt, *op*. *cit*., pp. 250-75.

If the scholarly reconstruction here accepted is correct, then it is evident that Deuteronomy can be described as a "later Northern tradition" only if one refers to the final composition in the 7th century. In fact the Deuteronomic traditions must have existed in some form from the period of the amphictyony. This means that it is a stream of tradition *parallel* to those which we have discussed, including E, and that some of the same tradition circles may have been involved in the preservation and transmission of all of these related traditions.

---

[12] Cf. Alt, op. cit., pp. 265f.

[13] Cf. especially von Rad, op. cit., pp. 45-73.

[14] Ibid., pp. 60-69. Cf. G. E. Wright, op. cit., pp. 326, 488-90.

(1) Deuteronomy and the Content of J and E

Our first and most obvious task is to discuss the significance of the Deuteronomic use of the *content* of the earlier epic traditions. The two main passages containing historical retrospect, Dt. 1:6-3:9 and 9:8-10:11, make a host of allusions to and even direct citations of narratives which we find in the Tetrateuch. Relying on the extremely helpful tables of S. R. Driver,[15] we list the main quotations and allusions as follows, the passages which according to our analysis in Ch. III are certainly or probably E being starred:

Dt. 1:7a	Num. 14:25
1:8	Gen. 15:16; *22:16f.; 24:7; 26:3
1:9b	Num. 11:14
1:12	*Num. 11:17b
1:13a	Cf. *Ex. 18:21a
1:15	*Ex. 18:25
1:17b	*Ex. 18:22; *18:26
1:18	Cf. Ex. 24 3, 7
1:23	Cf. Num. 13:2b
1:24a	Num. 13:17, 23
1:25a	Num. 13:20
1:25b	Num. 13 26

---

[15] *Deuteronomy* (ICC), pp. xv-xvii, 10, 19, 24, 29, 33, 42, 46, 51, 66, 112.

1:27	Num. 14:2b-3a
1:28	Num. 13:28
1:30	Ex. 13:21; 14:14
1:32	Cf. Num. 14:11b
1:33	Ex. 13:21; Num. 14:14b
1:33a	Num. 10:33b
1:35-36	Num. 14:23-24
1:39	Num. 14:31; cf. Num. 14:3
1:40	Num. 14:25b
1:41a	Num. 14:40b
1:42	Num. 14:42
1:43b	Num. 14:41, 44
1:44	Num. 14:45
1:46a	Num. 20:1
2:1a	Num. 14:25b
2:1b	Num. 21:4
2:8b	Num. 21:11
2:13	Cf. Num. 21:12
2:14b	Num. 32:13b
2:18, 24a	Cf. Num. 21:13
2:26a	Num. 21:21
2:27a	Num. 21:22
2:27b	Num. 20:17
2:28b	Num. 20:19b
2:30	Num. 21:23a
2:32	Num. 21:33b
2:32b	Num. 21:23b
2:33b	Num. 21:35a
2:34a	Num. 21:25a
2:36-37	Cf. Num. 21:24-25
3:1-2	Num. 21:33-34
3:3b	Num. 21:35a
3:4-7	Cf. Num. 21:35b
3:8-10	Cf. Num. 21:24-25, 35
3:12-13	Cf. Num. 32:33
3:14	Num. 32:41
3:15	Num. 32:40
3:18b	Num. 32:21
3:19a	Num. 32:1, 26
4:3	Num. 25:1-5
4:10-12; 5:2ff.; 18:16	*Ex. 19:3-6, 9, *17b, 18, 19; *20:20; 20:1; *20:18,*21b; *20:19; cf. *24:12f.
6:16	*Ex. 17:7
6:21f	Ex. 13:14; 14:30

8:3, 16	Ex. 16:4-5
8:15	Num. 21:6; *Ex. 17:6
9:22	*Num. 11:1-3, 34; *17:7
9:9	*Ex. 24:12, 18b
9:9b	Ex. 34:8a
9:10a	Ex. 31:18b
9:12	*Ex. 32:7-8a
9:13	*Ex. 32:9
9:14b	*Ex. 32:10b (cf. Num. 14:12b)
9:15	*Ex. 32:15
9:16	Cf. *Ex. 32:19a
9:17	*Ex. 32:19b
9:18-19	Ex. 34:28
9:21	*Ex. 32:20
9:22	*Num. 11:1-3; *Ex. 17:7; Num. 11:4-34
9:27	*Ex. 32:11b
9:27a	*Ex. 32:13
9:28	Num. 14:16; cf. *Ex. 32:12
10:1a	Ex. 34:1a
10:1b	Ex. 34:2
10:2a	Ex. 34:1b
10:3b	Ex. 34:4
10:4	Ex. 34:28
10:10	Cf. Ex. 34:9f., 28a
10:11	*Cf. Ex. 33:1
11:4	Ex. 14:27
11:6	Num. 16:1b, 27b, 30, 32a
23:5f	Num. 22:2-24:25
24:9	*Num. 12:10
25:17-19	*Ex. 17:8-16
26:6-8	Ex. 1:9, 12; *3:7, 9
29:22	Gen. 19:24f.

A glance at the number of passages starred as "E" shows immediately that Deuteronomy is by no means solely dependent upon the E tradition. As a whole, more of the Tetrateuchal passages cited are from J than from E, although a good many that are unmarked are of undetermined non-Priestly origin and must be designated simply "JE." The table thus supports Driver's conclusion that Deuteronomy is demonstrably dependent upon the earlier epic traditions which he designated "JE," but exclusively dependent upon neither J nor E.[16] This is as true of the section 9:8-10:11, considered by most scholars to be part of the original Deuteronomic work, as it is of the first historical retrospect, 1:1-4:43, which can be viewed as the work of the later Deuteronomic historian.[17] The unusually heavy use of E in Dt. 9 results from the subject-matter--the story of the Golden Calf, which is basically E--rather than from any peculiar affinity for the content of the E tradition.

Much the same can be said of the Deuteronomic use of earlier legal materials. The legal matter of Dt. 12-26 is almost entirely based on the "JE" laws of Exodus, particularly the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20:22-23:33.[18] This heavy use of the Covenant Code proves no necessary dependence on E, even for scholars who attribute the insertion of this legal corpus to E, for the Code must have had an independent existence and fairly general dissemination before it could become part of the Sinai tradition.[19]

---

[16] *Ibid*., p. xix.

[17] See above, pp. 187ff.

[18] Driver, *op*. *cit*., pp. viii-xiv.

[19] Cf. Procksch, *op*. *cit*., p. 271.

We must conclude, then, that the relation of Deuteronomy to E is not to be argued in terms of content. In both the historical and the legal sections Deuteronomy is demonstrably dependent on earlier formulations of tradition, but not exclusively dependent upon either our "J" or our "E." The relation to E and other Northern traditions must be sought in the realms of theological emphasis and stylistic convention.

(2) E and the Deuteronomic Theology

Here the situation is quite different. The theological motifs which indicated the close relation of E to the prophetic Samuel traditions and to the later Elijah traditions, as well as to Hosea, are evident also in Deuteronomy.

The most salient of these recurrent motifs, and the one which characterizes the E tradition most clearly, is the interest in prophecy and the tendency to depict Israel's heroes as prophets. This finds its echo in Deuteronomy in the passage promising revelation and leadership for Israel through a prophet "like Moses" (18:15-18):

נביא מקרבך מאחיך כמוני יקים לך יהוה אלהיך אליו תשמעון: ככל
אשר שאלת מעם יהוה אלהיך בחרב ביום הקהל למאר לא אסף לשמע את
קול יהוה אלהי ואת האש הגדלה הזאת לא אראה עוד ולא אמות:
ויאמר יהוה אלי הטיבו אשר דברו: נביא אקים להם מקרב אחיהם
כמוך ונתתי דברי בפיו ודבר אליהם את כל אשר אצונו.

Of this passage Procksch correctly comments,[20]

---

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 265-66.

> Er hängt nicht nur mit Hosea, sondern letzlich mit E zusammen, wo ja der Prophet die leitende religiöse Persönlichkeit ist. Und wenn Mose als klassischer Typus des wahren Propheten gilt (Dt. 18:15), so ist wie bei E und bei Hosea das Prophetentum aristokratisch aufgefasst im Gegensatz zu der Traumseherei, die vom Gesetz niedrig eingeschätzt wird (Dt. 13:14).

E's implication that the office of Moses was prophetic is thus explicitly stated by Deuteronomy. In fact, the identification of the prophet's role with that of the covenant mediator in the above passage suggests the very type of prophetic leadership which we postulated for the 10th century on the basis of the prophetic traditions of I Samuel. Thus Deuteronomy, in its view of the nature and function of prophecy, and in its emphasis on the significance of prophetic revelation, stands very close to E and to the other Northern traditions.

The same can be said for the Deuteronomic view on another highly important institution, the kingship. Alt has remarked on the striking absence, in the "law for the king" in Dt. 17:14-20, of any positive evaluation of the king's role in Israel's life:[21]

> Irgendwelche positive Funktionen, die für eine gedeihliche Entwicklung des Volkslebens unentbehrlich wären, vermag er den Königen nicht zuzuschreiben, weder auf dem Gebiet der Kriegführung noch auf dem der Rechtspflege, die er doch beide als integrierende Bestandteile der Volksordnung betrachtet und dementsprechend verhältnissmässig eingehend behandelt.

---

[21] Op. cit., KS Vol. II, p. 264.

This view of kingship is not, of course, surprising, in view of the North-Israelite provenance of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy in fact echoes the Northern prophetic traditions of Samuel in viewing kingship as an assimilation to the surrounding pagan culture (Dt. 17:4; cf. I Sam. 8). In the face of the developing monarchy Deuteronomy, like the followers of Samuel, can only hope to preserve a vestige of the amphictyonic order by viewing the king as subordinate to covenant law and by keeping alive the amphictyonic institutions of holy war and Levitical teaching.

The E tradition, as we have seen, implies the same view of the monarchy through its indirect polemic against Jeroboam I, and through its exaltation of the prophet as leader. Deuteronomy and the other Northern traditions express this bias openly whereas E, perhaps because of the limitations imposed by the epic materials, could only suggest it indirectly.

A close similarity between Deuteronomy and E can also be seen in the broader and more subtle elements which make up the understanding of history. Like E, Deuteronomy envisions the goal of Israel's life in deeply religious terms; cf. especially Ex. 19:3-6 with Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18. Like E, and to an even greater degree, Deuteronomy views the whole course of Israel's history in terms of specifically religious categories. The result is the strongly didactic presentation of history, the merging of narrative into exhortation, which so unmistakably characterizes the Deuteronomic tradition. We found this same tendency toward a didactic presentation of history in E, though in a less developed form.[22]

Almost equally important as a distinguishing mark of the E tradition in the Tetrateuch was the theme of the fear of God, expressed by the verb ירא. We find this also as a recurrent motif in Deuteronomy, appearing altogether in sixteen passages.[23] This usage is significant when we consider that it is not found in J passages at all. In E the theme of the יראת אלהים points up the explicitly religious tone of the tradition and expresses the demand for human awe and obedience which is also so central in Deuteronomy.

Similarly, the Deuteronomic emphasis on obedience to God is paralleled in E. The recurrent demand that Israel "hearken to the voice of Yahweh" (שמע בקול יהוה) finds a verbal parallel in only a few Tetrateuchal passages, which may not be E texts, but the emphasis on obedience to the covenant Lord of Israel is also a frequent motif in E narratives.[24]

---

[22] Weiser even suggests that the E traditions, through centuries of liturgical use, eventually developed through "a hortatory, sermon-like shape" into the Deuteronomic tradition of history (Introduction, p. 125).

[23] See the comprehensive tables in Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxviii-lxxxiv, and the shorter tables and discussion by Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-20.

(3) E and the Style of Deuteronomy

It has proved impossible, in our discussion of theological similarities between Deuteronomy and E, to avoid stylistic features. This is as it should be because, as we tried to show in Ch. III, theological and stylistic features go hand in hand when we are dealing with the work of a school of tradition rather than the production of a single author.

It also happens to be the case that most non-theologically conditioned similarities in style vanish or become very dubious under analysis. The Deuteronomic use of Horeb for Sinai is a case in point. It is frequently claimed that this is also a dependable feature of the style of E, and that the related Northern provenance of E and Deuteronomy is illustrated by the use of Horeb in both. But we have accepted Noth's argument that the appearances of Horeb in E texts is secondary. We cannot be certain, then, that the Deuteronomic use of Horeb finds any echo in E. The same is true of the use of "Amorites" for the original inhabitants of Canaan. If Noth is correct in denying this as a connection between E and Deuteronomy then nothing can be shown about the relation between the two traditions by this means.

---

[24] Ex. 15:26; 19:5; 23:21-22; Num. 14:22. Of these passages we assigned only Ex. 19:5 to E, but cf. G. E. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

When we turn to stylistic features which have some connection with characteristic theological motifs the case is different. Both Deuteronomy and E, for example, speak emphatically of the יראת אלהים. The usage is significant, as we remarked above, in pointing to the distinctively religious tone of both E and Deuteronomy, and suggests that both traditions drew on a common stock of linguistic-theological motifs.

The use of the verb שרת has also been pointed to as a contact between Deuteronomy and E. Deuteronomy uses שרת several times in speaking of the ministry of Levites or Levitical priests (10:8; 17:12; 18:5; 18:7; 21:5). We find the verb elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in E (Gen. 40:4; Ex. 24:13; 33:11; Num. 11:28), except for one passage in the Joseph stories which we assigned to J (Ex. 39:4), and the derived noun משרת was applied by E to Joshua in several passages (Ex. 24:13; 33:11; Num. 11:28). The verb also appears frequently in P (e.g., Ex. 28:35; Num. 3:6). This peculiarity indicates a possible relationship between the E and D schools and suggests that both might be connected with priestly or Levitical groups. This is consonant with our theory that E was the product of a Levitical or prophetic-Levitical school that traced its ancestry to a

Northern location.

Other stylistic similarities may be important, but are more difficult to explain on the theological side. The recurrent Deuteronomic phrase "God of my (/thy, etc.) father" is also found in a number of E passages (Gen. 31:5, 29, 42, 53; 46:1b, 3; 50:17; Ex. 3:13-16). In the E tradition this might reflect a desire to make explicit the identity of the ancient El deity of the patriarchs, whose cult was still alive in the Northern Kingdom at the time of Jeroboam I, with Yahweh, the God of the Exodus tradition. In the Deuteronomic tradition the expression is conventionalized, though it does serve to emphasize the motif of the land promised to the fathers.

Finally, we should mention Deuteronomy's use of התפלל in the Golden Calf story (9:20, 26). At first sight, two occurrences of this word, which appears a few times in E (Gen. 20:7, 17; Num. 11:2) but not in J, would not seem to provide evidence of affinity with E. But the use in Deuteronomy might be significant, since the verb is introduced into passages where it does not occur in the Ex. 32 tradition which is being followed. This serves to lay heavier stress on the intercessory function of Moses, thus agreeing with E's depiction of the prophetic leaders of Israel as intercessors (cf. also Samuel, Elijah).

One last point should be mentioned as we conclude our discussion of Deuteronomy. In dealing with theological and stylistic similarities between E and Deuteronomy we have avoided basing our argument on Tetrateuchal passages which have been claimed for both E and D. Such texts as Ex. 19:3-6 and 23:20-33 display such remarkable similarities to Deuteronomic style and interests that they have in the past been regarded as secondary expansions under Deuteronomic influence. The tendency now is to regard them as E, in view of the improbability of any thorough Deuteronomic revision of the Tetrateuch.[25] In our discussion of these texts we were inclined to designate Ex. 19:3-6 as E, but to associate 23:20-33 with the Covenant Code, which we do not regard as E. If the passages are both E, then the theological and stylistic similarities between E and Deuteronomy are considerably more extensive than we have indicated. No certainty is possible, however, precisely because their language is so close to what we expect from the Deuteronomic school, and because we do not have sufficient independent evidence for the style of E.

Conclusion

The results of this brief chapter and of our entire investigation can now be summed up. There is no doubt that the Deuteronomic tradition has some affinity with the North

---

[25] So Wright, op. cit., p. 320.

Israelite traditions concerning Samuel, Elijah and Elisha, and with the E tradition in the Pentateuch, as well as with the Northern prophet Hosea. All of these traditions are characterized by an emphasis on prophecy and by a negative judgment of monarchy. At the same time one can observe, particularly in the E tradition, a clearly defined interest in the nature and modes of divine revelation.

Whether this associated body of traditions shares a definable characteristic style and vocabulary is more doubtful. The Deuteronomic style appears to have had its own history, doubtless developing in a tradition of liturgical teaching and preaching. Hosea's style is highly idiosyncratic, although he draws on themes and reflects attitudes common to the whole body of Northern traditions. In neither E nor the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel, Elijah, or Elisha could we distinguish a unified style, but only a related theological outlook and a few set expressions which are shared in conjunction with theological emphases.

The result of our entire investigation has therefore been partly negative. We are dubious about the possibility of carrying out the minute literary analysis of an earlier generation, although the possibility of this detailed analysis varies according to the text in question. Yet we believe that we can meet or profitably assimilate the criticisms of Volz, Rudolph, Engnell, and others who would discard the entire structure built up by literary critics of the past and present.

A definable body of E traditions can be isolated and studied in relation to the history and traditions of the Northern Kingdom. This examination shows that, far from being of less significance or value than the J tradition, E is highly important as one of the earliest expressions of Hebrew literary activity and Hebrew prophecy. The attitudes and beliefs which find utterance in this early tradition reach their culmination in the prophetic address to all Israel of Hosea, Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, and live on to become a formative influence in all later thought and belief in the Jewish and Christian communities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Albright, W. F. *Archeology and the Religion of Israel*. 4th ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.

________. *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. 2d. ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1957.

________. *Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement*. Cincinnatti: Hebrew Union College, 1961.

Alt, Albrecht. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols. 2. Aufl. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.

Anderson, B. W., and Harrelson, W. *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. Essays in honor of James Muilenburg. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Astruc, Jean. *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse*. Brussels: Chez Fricx, 1753.

Baltzer, Klaus. *Das Bundesformular*. (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 4). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.

Beer, George. *Exodus*, mit einem Beitrag von Kurt Galling. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1939.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1948.

Beyerlin, Walther. *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961.

Biblia Hebraica. ed. Rudolph Kittel. 9th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1954.

Bleek, Friedrich. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. herausgegeben von J. Bleek und A. Kampenhausen. 2. Aufl. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1865.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

________. *Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Joshua*. (*Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick. Vol. II, pp. 541-673.) New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

Budde, Karl. Die Bücher Samuel. (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. ed. Karl Marti. Vol. VII.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1902.

Buttrick, G. A., ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Buxtorf, Johann. *Biblia Hebraica Rabbinica*. Basel: Johannis König, 1665.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, and Harford-Battersby, G. *The Hexateuch*. 2 vol. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1900.

Coppens, Joseph. *The Old Testament and the Critics*. trans. from the French by E. A. Ryan and E. Tribbe. Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942.

Cornill, Carl H. *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 7. Aufl. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1913.

Davies, T. W. *Heinrich Ewald, Orientalist and Theologian, 1803-1903: A Centenary Appreciation*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903.

De Wette, W. M. L. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 2 vols. Halle: Schimmelpfennig und Cie., 1806-1807.

Driver, S. R. *The Book of Exodus*. (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1911.

________. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (International Critical Commentaries.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.

Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. (First published, 1897.) New York: Meridian Library, 1956.

Dussaud, R. *Les origines cananéenes du sacrifice israélite*. Paris: Leroux, 1921.

Ehrlich, E. L. *Der Traum im Alten Testament*. (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Bd. 73.) Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1953.

Eichhorn, J. G. *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*. 2 vols. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Weidmanns Erben & Reich, 1787.

________. *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, Bd. I-III. 4. Aufl. Göttingen: Carl Eduard Rosenbusch, 1823.

Eichrodt, W. *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I. Trans. J. A. Baker from *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (6. Aufl.; Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, 1959). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 2. Aufl. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956.

________. *Die Genesis der Genesis: vom Werdegang des ersten Buches des Bibel*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958.

________.*Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1948.

________. *Hexateuch-Synopse: Die Erzahlung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1922.

Ewald, G. H. A. von. *Die Composition der Genesis*. Braunschweig, 1823.

________. *Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, 1851.

Fohrer, Georg. *Elia*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957.

Geddes, Alexander. *The Holy Bible, with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Remarks*, Vol. I, London: J. Davis, 1792.

George, J. F. L. *Die älteren Jüdischen Feste, mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuch*. Berlin: E. H. Schroeder, 1835.

Gorden, Cyrus. *Ugaritic Handbook*. (Analecta Orientalia 35). Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.

Graf, Karl H. *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866.

Gray, G. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Numbers*.(International Critical Commentaries.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Gressmann, Hugo. *Mose und seine Zeit: Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.

Gunkel, Hermann, *Genesis übersetzt und erklärt*. (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, ed. W. Nowack.) 2. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Oxford: James Thornton, 1881.

Hölscher, Gustav. *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1952.

Holzinger, H. *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893.

________. *Exodus*. (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, ed. Karl Marti. Vol. II.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.

Hupfeld, Hermann. *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*. Berlin: Verlag von Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853.

Ilgen, K. D. *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt.* Halle: Hemmerde und Schwetschke, 1798.

Kittel, Rudolph. Geschichte der Hebräer. Gotha: Perthes, 1888.

Kosters, W. H. *De Historie-Beschouwing van den Deuteronomist met de Berichten in Genesis-Numeri Vergeleken*. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh, 1868.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*. Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungs-Vereins, 1956.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Gottesdienst in Israel: Studien zur Geschichte des Laubhüttenfestes.* (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Bd. 19.) München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1954.

Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch.* (trans. from the 2d Dutch edn. of *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Oudes Verbonds*, 1885.) London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.

________. *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State.* Trans. A. H. May. 3 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1874.

Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament.* Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.

Lods, Adolphe. *Jean Astruc et la critique Biblique au XVIIIe siècle, avec une notice biographique par Paul Alphandery.* Strasbourg: Libraire Istra, 1924.

Marsh, John. *Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Numbers.* (*Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick. Vol. II, pp. 137-308.) New York: Abingdon, 1953.

Mauchline, John. *Introduction and Exegesis of Hosea.* (*Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick. Vol. VI, pp. 553-725) New York: Abingdon, 1956.

Mendenhall, G. E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and in the Ancient Near East.* Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

Montgomery, J. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings.* ed. H. S. Gehmann. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. I-11.* Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1937.

Newman, Murray. *The People of the Covenant.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Nielsen, E. *Oral Tradition. A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction.* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 11.) London: SCM Press, 1958.

Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua.* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. O. Eissfeldt. Erste Reihe, 7.) 2. Aufl. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

________. *Exodus, A Commentary.* trans. J. S. Bowden from *Das zweite Buch Mose, Exodus* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

________. *The History of Israel.* trans. by Stanley Godman from the second German edn. of *Geschichte Israels.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

________. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch.* 2. Aufl. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.

________. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Erster Teil: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

Oppenheim, A. L. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East, with a Translation of an Assyrian Dream Book.* Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. XLVI, Pt. 3. Philadelphia, 1956.

The Oxford Annotated Bible. ed. H. G. May, and B. Metzger. New York: Oxford Press, 1962.

Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture, I-II.* London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Pereira, Benedictus, S. J. *Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim.* Rome: Georgium Ferrarium, 1591.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.

Pope, M. H. *El in the Ugaritic Texts.* (*Vetus Testamentum Supplementum*, IV) Leiden: Brill, 1955.

Procksch, Otto. *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch die Elohimquelle.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch.* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, 4. Folge, Heft 26.) Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.

________. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament.* Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis: A Commentary. Trans. John H. Marks from Das Erste Buch Mose, Genesis. (Alte Testament Deutsch.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

________. Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

________. Old Testament Theology, Vol. I: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker from Theologie des Alten Testaments (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957). London: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.

________. Studies in Deuteronomy. Trans. David Stalker from rev. edn. of Deuteronomium-Studien (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948). Studies in Biblical Theology, N. 9. London: SCM Press, 1953.

________. Theologie des Alten Testaments. 2 vols. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957-60.

Reuss, Eduard. Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments. 2. Aufl. Braunschweig: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1890.

________. L'histoire Sainte et la Loi. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Sanoz et Fischbacher, 1879.

Rowley, H. H., ed. The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery and Research. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 68.) Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1938.

Simon, Richard. Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament. Paris, 1680.

Simpson, C. A. The Early Traditions of Israel. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1948.

Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. (International Critical Commentaries.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

________. The Divine Names in Genesis. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

Smend, Rudolph. *Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1912.

Smith, H. P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. (International Critical Commentaries.) New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Smith, W. Robertson. *The Old Testament and the Jewish Church*. 2d. edn. London: A & C Black, 1892.

Spinoza, Benedict de. *Tractuatus Theologico-Politici*, in Vol. I of his *Opera*. Edited by H. E. G. Paulus. Jena: in Bibliopolio Academico, 1802.

Stamm, J. J. *Le Décalogue à la lumière des recherches contemporaines*. French trans. by P. Reymond. Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959.

Steinmann, Jean. *Richard Simon et les origines de l'exégèse biblique*. Bruges: Éditions Desclée de Brouwer, 1960.

Thenius, O. *Die Bücher Samuelis*. Edited by Max Löhr. (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Bd. IV.) Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1898.

Tuch, J. C. Friedrich. *Commentar über die Genesis*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1838.

Vater, J. S. *Commentar über den Pentateuch, mit Einleitungen zu den einzelnen Abschnitten*. 2 Vols. Halle: Verlag der Waisenhaus-Buchhandlung, 1802.

Vatke, J. K. W. *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftliche dargestellt*. Bd. I: *Die Religion des Alten Testaments nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt*. Berlin: Bethge, 1835.

Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*. Trans. by John McHugh from *Les Institutions de l'Ancient Testament* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Volz, Paul, and Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Der Elohist als Erzähler ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?.* *(Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 63.) Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1933.

Weiser, Artur. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 4. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

Weiser, Artur. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton from *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4. Aufl. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957). London: Darton, Longmann, & Todd, 1961.

________. *Samuel; seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu 1. Samuel 7-12.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Wellhausen, J. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1889.

________. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel.* Trans. by Black and Menzies from the 2d. German edn. (Berlin: George Reimer, 1883). New York: Meridian Library, 1957.

Westermann, C. *Grundformen Prophetischer Reden.* Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960.

Westphal, A. *Les Sources du Pentateuque, Étude de Critique et d'Histoire.* 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1888.

Wolff, H. W. *Hosea.* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. XIV.) Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungs-Vereins, 1961.

Wright, G. Ernest, ed. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1961.

________. *Biblical Archeology.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

________. *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital.* Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 8. London: SCM Press, 1952.

________. *Introduction and Exegesis of Deuteronomy. The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick. Vol. II, pp. 311-537. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

Articles

Albright, W. F. and Mowinckel, S. "The Babylonian Matter in the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LVIII (1939), pp. 87-103.

________. "Jethro, Hobab, and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XXV (1963), pp. 1-11.

________. "The Oracles of Balaam," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXIII (1944), pp. 207-233.

________, Review of Mowinckel's *The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11*, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LVII (1938), pp. 230-236.

Alt, Albrecht. "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), Vol. II, pp. 250-275.

________. "Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, Vol. II, pp. 116-34.

________. "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, Vol. II, pp. 1-65.

________. "Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, Vol. I, pp. 278-332.

________. "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I, pp. 79-88.

Boling, Robert G. "Synonymous Parallelism in the Psalms," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Vol. V, No. 3 (1960), pp. 221-255.

Bright, John. "Modern Study of Old Testament Literature," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 13-31.

Cross, F. M., Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "The Blessing of Moses," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXVII (1948), pp. 191-210.

________, and Wright, G. E., "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXXV (1956), pp. 202-226.

________, and Freedman, D. N., "The Song of Miriam," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. XIV (1955), pp. 237-50.

________. "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. LV, No. 4 (1962), pp. 225-259.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Die älteste Erzählung vom Sinaibund," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. 73 (N.F. 32), No. 2 (1961)

________. "Die Komposition der Bileam-Erzählung," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. LVII (1939), pp. 212-241.

________. "Lade und Stierbild," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. LXIII (1940/41), pp. 190-215.

Engnell, Ivan. "Moseböckerna," *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*. Ivan Engnell and Anton Fridrichsen, eds. 2d. edition (Stockholm: Nordiska Uppslagsböcker, 1963), Vol. II, cols. 154-60.

Ewald, G. H. A. von. Review of Stähelin's *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis*. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Vol. IV (1831), pp. 595-606.

Freedman, D. N. "Hexateuch," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Abingdon, 1962), Vol. II, pp. 597-598.

Good, E. M. "The Book of Joshua," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Abingdon, 1962), Vol. II, pp. 988-995.

Greenberg, Moshe. " נסה in Exodus 20:20 and the Purpose of the Sinaitic Theophany," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXXIX (1960), pp. 273-276.

Gressmann, Hugo. "Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Sage," *Eucharisterion für Hermann Gunkel*, Vol. I. Edited by Hans Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 1-55.

Gunkel, Hermann. "Die Komposition der Joseph-Geschichten," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1922, pp. 55ff.

Harrelson, Walter. "Golden Calf," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 488-489.

Harvey, Julien. "Le 'Rîb-Pattern,' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Biblica*, Vol. XLIII (1962), pp. 172-196.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXXVIII (1959), pp. 285-295.

Kaiser, Otto. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung vom Genesis 15," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. LXX (1958), pp. 107-126.

Knierim, Rolf. "Exodus 18 und die Neuordnung der mosäischen Gerichtbarkeit," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. XXXII (N.F.), No. 2 (1961),

Mazar, Benjamin. "The Aramean Empire and its Relations with Israel," *The Biblical Archeologist*, Vol. XXV (1962), pp. 98-120.

Mendelsohn, I. "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," *The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 143 (1956), pp. 17-22.

Mendenhall, G. E. "Biblical History in Transition," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 32-49.

________. "Covenant." *Interpreter's Dictionary of the* Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 714-723.

Mowinckel, S. "Der Ursprung der Bilʿamsage," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. XLVIII (1930), pp. 233-271.

Muilenburg, James. "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. IX (1959), pp. 351-357.

Newman, Murray. "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 94-97.

North, C. R. "Pentateuchal Criticism," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 48-83.

Obbink, H. Th. "Jahwebilder," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. XLVII (1929), pp. 264-274.

Pedersen, Johannes. "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. XLIX (1931), pp. 161-181.

________. "Passahfest und Passahlegende," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. LII (1934), pp. 161-175.

Rowley, H. H. "The Marriage of Hosea," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. XXXIX (1956-57), pp. 200-233.

________. "Moses and the Decalogue," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. XXXIV (1951), pp. 81-118.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. "Der Aufbau von Exodus 19-34," Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, ed. J. Hempel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 66 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1936), pp. 41-48.

Smart, J. D. "The Book of Hosea," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. II, pp. 648-653.

Snaith, Norman. "The Historical Books," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 97-102.

Speiser, E. A. "The Stem PLL ~~in Hebrew,~~" Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXXXII (1963), pp. 301-306.

Spiegel, Shalom. "A Prophetic Attestation of the Decalogue: Hosea 6:5," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XXVII (1934), pp. 105-144.

Vriezen, Th. C. "La Tradition de Jacob dans Osée XII," *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, ed. P. A. H. de Boer (Leiden: Brill, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 64-78.

Weiser, Artur. "I Samuel 15," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. LIV (1936), pp. 1-28.

________. "Samuels 'Philister-Sieg,'" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. LVI (1959), pp. 253-272.

Wellhausen, Julius. "Die Composition des Hexateuchs," *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, Vol. XXI (1876), pp. 392-450, 531-602; Vol. XXII (1877), pp. 407-479.

Wright, G. Ernest. "The Book of Exodus," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. II, pp. 188-197.

________. "Cult and History: A Study of a Current Problem in Old Testament Interpretation," *Interpretation*, Vol. XVI (1962), pp. 3-20.

________. "The Lawsuit of God; A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 26-67.

________. "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," *Expository Times*, Vol. LXXI (1960), pp. 3-7.

________. "Old Testament Scholarship in Prospect," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. XXIII (1960), pp. 182-93.

________. "The Plagues in Exodus," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. III, pp. 822-24.

________. "Recent European Study in the Pentateuch," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. XVIII (1950), pp. 216-225.

THE ELOHIST AND NORTH ISRAELITE TRADITIONS

by

Alan W. Jenks

A Summary

This thesis proposes to submit the E traditions in the Pentateuch to a fresh study in the light of the most recent developments in Old Testament scholarship.

First identified by Hupfeld in 1853, the E strand was characterized by the older literary critics as an independent epic narrative reaching from the Patriarchal stories in Genesis to the account of the Conquest in Joshua. According to these critics, this source is marked by the use of Elohim for the Deity, by a more advanced theological and ethical outlook than J's, and by a particular interest in prophecy. These characteristics led the critics to date E to the era of the first classical prophets, *ca*. 750 B.C.

In recent decades the hypothesis of an independent E source has been under attack, principally from two directions:

(1) The Scandinavian scholars Johannes Pedersen and Ivan Engnell have attempted to demolish the whole literary-critical structure, attacking both the presuppositions and the methodology of 19th-century criticism. They claim that

the Documentary Hypothesis was based on the fantasies of academicians, who pictured the composition of the Pentateuch in terms of the mechanical editing of a group of documents, while in fact the epic tradition in Israel grew out of the repetition and elaboration of stories in the life, especially the cultic life, of the ancient Hebrews. The core of the Pentateuch is the story of deliverance from Egypt in Ex. 1-15; this is the cult-legend of Passover. The whole vast series of narratives grew, through centuries of oral elaboration, around this nucleus. Attempts to find continuous "sources" with characteristic theologies and vocabularies, are futile.

(2) The German scholars Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph have tried to show, by methods of literary analysis, that the passages attributed to E are actually a heterogeneous collection of supplements to the one basic tradition, J.

Concurrently, new views of the growth of the Hexateuch have grown up without discarding the literary-critical findings. Gerhard von Rad has emphasized the importance of the "cultic credos," summaries of the Heilsgeschichte in use in the tribal league period (e.g., Dt. 26:5b-9). These credal statements of the saving events provided the framework for the J author, who wrote in the 10th century. It was he who created the epic form on the outlines of the credo, knitting together a vast array of narrative material drawn from cultic and tribal traditions.

Martin Noth has pushed the creative period further back, into the tribal-league epoch, and has theorized the existence at that time of a common epic tradition upon which both the Yahwist and the Elohist authors later drew for their separate epics.

Noth's hypothesis of a common epic tradition preceding J and E is accepted as more plausible than von Rad's heavy dependence upon the creative genius of one hypothetical author, the Yahwist. Both Noth and von Rad, however, fail to see the importance of the covenant form for understanding the origin of the Pentateuchal traditions. As now known from the research of Mendenhall and Baltzer, Israel's covenant with Yahweh was conceived on the analogy of the suzerain-vassal relationship defined in state treaties of the late second millennium, particularly in Hittite sources. The covenant was cast in the form of such a treaty, and like the treaties opened with a recital of the suzerain's gracious acts on behalf of his vassal in the past. In covenant renewal ceremonies in the tribal-league period, Israel must similarly have recited the Heilsgeschichte. This is the primary Sitz im Leben of the credos noted by von Rad. At the same time these covenant prologues provided the outline and theological direction for the epic tradition. This tradition was later expressed in two parallel forms by Southern (J) and Northern (E) schools.

An examination of the passages attributed to the E source shows that the conclusions of literary criticism must be modified in several ways, but that the hypothesis of an independent E epic tradition of North Israelite origin can be retained. The minute, word-by-word division into separate sources cannot be sustained, but a considerable body of traditions can be isolated which characteristically use Elohim, emphasize fear of God and obedience, interpreting Israel's history in specifically religious categories. Above all these traditions are distinguished by a concern with problems of revelation, and a tendency to depict the great figures of Israelite tradition, from Abraham to Moses, as prophets. Most of the supposed characteristic vocabulary and style of E, as defined by older literary critics, fails to stand up under analysis. Nevertheless, a few stylistic motifs can be detected, generally associated with one of the major theological themes of E.

The streams of Israelite literature which display the highest degree of affinity with the E traditions are the prophetic traditions concerning Samuel (the "Samuel source" in I Samuel); the Elijah-Elisha traditions of I-II Kings; Hosea; and Deuteronomy. The closest affinity is with the prophetic traditions in I Samuel. Like E, these traditions are marked by concern with prophetic revelation and the role of the prophet, an emphasis on obedience and the fear of God, and a condemnation of monarchy as rebellion against the charismatic rule of the prophet. In E this anti-monarchical bias is reflected in the story of the making of the Golden Calf (Ex. 32), a transparent polemic against the cultic establishment of the first Northern monarch, Jeroboam I. The opponent of the king in both traditions is the prophet, whose role combines the offices of judge, seer, and holy-war leader, as represented in E by Moses and in the prophetic Samuel traditions by Samuel.

The depiction of the prophet and his role in the Elijah-Elisha traditions is similar, though there is less emphasis upon his cultic roles, and a new stress on the address of the prophet to all Israel, charging the whole people with breaking the covenant. The Elijah-Elisha traditions are dominated by the dual themes of the conflict with Baalism and the military conflict with the Arameans, neither of which are visible in E.

Therefore we date E in the period between Samuel and Elijah, and attribute it to a prophetic school in the Northern Kingdom. The Ex. 32 narrative suggests that the date of the fixation of this prophetic or prophetic-Levitical epic tradition must have been the time of the division of the Kingdom, ca. 922 B.C. The polemic against

Jeroboam's cultic establishment implied in this tradition would only be relevant during the time of the beginning of the North Israelite state. The establishment of the new state, with its rival monarchy and rival cultic establishment, could have called for a Northern epic tradition to rival the J tradition associated with the Kingdom of Judah. The indications are that Jeroboam was first backed by Northern prophets who hoped for a return to a non-dynastic, charismatically controlled monarchy; the E school's polemic in Ex. 32 may reflect prophetic disgust with Jeroboam's establishment of his own sanctuary, thus breaking the religious unity of Israel, and disillusionment concerning the possibility of combining theocracy with monarchy.

The 10th century date of E explains its characteristics more satisfactorily than the 8th century date given by former critics. The type of prophecy depicted is early, like that pictured in the Samuel and the Elijah-Elisha narratives, and the generally optimistic outlook of the E tradition points to a period before the great conflicts with paganism which began in Elijah's time. E is not in fact more advanced theologically than J, but narrower, less subtle, more specifically religious, because it is dominated by the special interests of prophets. The advanced ethical thinking once attributed to E is seen in its proper perspective when viewed as the modeling of patriarchal figures on the Vorbild of Samuel or some other early prophet. In fact, E's Moses seems to be modeled on Samuel as portrayed in the prophetic traditions of I Samuel. The use of Elohim is not theological but stylistic, analogous to the use of Elohim as the "A-word" in the Elohistic Psalter, and stems from an extremely ancient tradition in which the Deity is addressed as the totality of the pantheon, as in the address to the Pharaoh in the Amarna letters.

The last chapter discusses the relation of E to Hosea and Deuteronomy. There are very definite theological affinities with these Northern traditions, but little duplication in content. Hosea drew on still living oral traditions in speaking of Israel's sacred history, while Deuteronomy shows familiarity with both J and E versions of the epic tradition.

The theological affinities, however, are clear. Both Hosea and Deuteronomy share the negative evaluation of the monarchy typical of Northern traditions from Samuel on. Both explicitly call Moses a prophet, thus echoing the E tradition in its depiction of the ideal leader as a prophet. Both traditions, like E, stress obedience and the fear of God and speak in prophetic categories of revelation.

The E tradition is thus to be evaluated as a Northern epic, dating from the 10th century in its final formulation, and stemming from a prophetic or prophetic-Levitical school. It is thus a highly important and very early expression of Hebrew literary activity and religious faith.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS